

THE ORIGINS OF THE SPIRITUAL EXERCISES

ONE of the earliest harbingers of peace was the circular notice from Padre Cervós, the new editor of the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu*, to the effect that this serial, after the four years' interruption due to the war, would recommence with the work begun by the late Padre Rodeles on the Texts of St. Ignatius's *Spiritual Exercises*.¹ This makes it doubly appropriate to state in popular language what the chief problems are in regard to the *Exercises*, and to what assistance for their solution we may now look forward.

Everyone knows that Ignatius, from the beginning of his conversion, devoted himself with intense enthusiasm to the *Spiritual Exercises*, and that he is found giving them to others from the very start. In the brief biographies which first saw the light it was broadly said the *Spiritual Exercises* were "written" at this very period, but if we turn to the book itself we find certain difficulties. The saint was then ignorant of Latin, and unacquainted with theology; how then could he have made familiar use of little Latin colloquialisms in the Spanish text (e.g., *tamen, consequenter*) and of Latin technical words like *Annotationes, Additiones*, etc., which betray so plainly the pen of one used to clerical studies? There is also a fair sprinkling of theological terms, and of references to Church history, to which the recently converted soldier was certainly at first a stranger. Plainly, then, the intrinsic evidence does not exactly coincide here with the extrinsic. Again, no less than 27 years passed between the first beginnings of the *Exercises* and their final approval. Does not this leave a large opening for modifications, of which we have hitherto been told nothing? Finally, as every statement, whether human or Divine, is controverted at one time or another, what are we to think of those who question Ignatius's originality, and say that he copied the Benedictine Abbot Cisneros "word for word, only changing a little the order of the contents," echoes of which extravagancies are found in many of our encyclopædias?

¹*Exercitiorum Spiritualium S.P.N. Ignatii. editio historico-critica.* Address as before—Sr. Administrador de "Monumenta Historica S.J."; Apartado 106, Madrid.

Such questions, such considerations as these need a patient hearing and a careful answer at our hands, and we are now the better able to satisfy them through the excellent criticism published of late years by Fathers Astrain, Watrigant and Debuchy.¹ At the same time the documents published in the *Monumenta* series enable us to draw nearer to the historical facts than before, for their evidence is the earliest yet accessible. We will begin, therefore, with them.

Assuming that the reader is acquainted with the story of Ignatius's conversion by reading good books, to wit, Ludolph of Saxony's *Life of Christ* and the *Flores Sanctorum*, the first thing to note is that during convalescence he copied out with great care a series of extracts concerning the words and works of our Saviour. Some have regarded this as a first draft of the *Exercises*, but this is too broad a generalization. The meditations on the Life of Christ in the *Exercises* take up about one-fifth of the whole; so that four-fifths of that book would not have been represented in the collection of extracts. But above all it lacked the sequence of great meditations leading up to the "election," which, as we shall see, is the soul and essence of the book of *Exercises*. On the other hand, we may very well indeed regard this MS. of Christ's words and deeds as a *contribution* to the *Exercises*. For if one remembers that generally most of the time in retreat is devoted to meditations on the life of Christ, one might say that perhaps three-quarters of the meditation matter was originally drawn from this source. Moreover, this book of extracts might easily have grown into a draft of the *Exercises*, if, as Ignatius gradually worked out the essential steps of his plan, he had made notes of them in this volume. He told Father Gonzales de Cámara

That the exercises had not been composed all at once, but that when he noticed anything profitable to himself, he noted it down in a way which seemed likely to be of use to others, such as the method of examination of conscience by drawing lines, and the like. The "elections" in particular, he told me, he had taken from that alternation of spirit and thoughts, which he had while he was at Loyola, and was ill with his leg broken.²

When the saint left Loyola he went to the Abbey of Montserrat, where he made a general confession and communicated

¹ H. Watrigant—*La Genèse des Exercices de Saint Ignace*. Amiens, 1892; A. Astrain—*La Compañía de Jesús en España*. Madrid, 1902; P. Debuchy—*Introduction à l'Étude des Exercices de Loyola*. Enghien, 1906, and also in the *Catholic Encyclopædia* under *Spiritual Exercises*.

² See *Monumenta Ignatiana*, I., 97; Rix's translation, p. 194. The original Spanish being now accessible, a revision of this translation, which was made from the Latin version, is advisable.

on the Feast of the Annunciation, 25th March, 1522, and then went straight on to Manresa. Here he laboriously, prayerfully, and systematically went through the whole process of conversion and change of life. He began with the profoundest penance and the heroic purgation of the soul from all human imperfections. Slowly and step by step he went forwards, learning wisdom from his own mistakes. Ignatius's own words about this, as reported by Father Cámara are as follows.

God wrought with him at this time, as a master with a school-boy whom he teaches. But whether this was on account of his ignorance and slowness of mind; or because there was no one else to teach him, or because of his steadfast will to serve God . . . ; still he judges and always has judged that God did so deal with him. He could not call it in doubt without offending his Divine Majesty—(Similar humble protests of sincerity are repeated for half a page).

The same system is described by another of the saint's secretaries while speaking of his early penances. Polanco says :

In this matter as in others, he used to say it had happened to him that, by first making mistakes, he learned not to make them.¹

In both extracts Ignatius is cited as saying that his spiritual training was not from books or from any teacher or from the example of others. God teaching him "as a schoolmaster with a boy" no doubt means that He providentially made clear to His servant when mistakes were made ; and showed by experience how past faults might be avoided.

This slow process of purgation continued for nearly a year. After the first period of spiritual purgation came a painful spell of scruples. "He began to inquire of spiritual men for a remedy," says de Cámara, "but nothing helped him." The Dominicans are especially mentioned for their kindness at this time, and Father de Pellaros is said to have been his confessor. But no one was able to show the fervent beginner at what point the cloven hoof came into his troubles. Still under the same guidance from above as before, he gradually found the measure of the foe, and the *Rules for Scruples* and *Rules for the Discernment of Spirits* are the result of experiences turned to good purpose.

Thus he advanced until at last prayer became perfectly easy, until he was frequently lost in the absorbing delights of contemplation, and sometimes he lay a day or days motionless, sunk in a trance. In other words, he passed through the entire process of spiritual conversion from first to last. He had

¹ *Mon. Ig. I.*, 53 ; translation p. 88. Polanco, *Chronicon*, p. 24.

sounded every note and every semitone in its gamut, he had become experimentally acquainted with *the method* by which the spiritual life is raised from the depths of sin and human weakness to the high union of the purified soul with God.

Now, that methodic progress is, in fact, the soul and essence of Ignatius's *Spiritual Exercises*. They are not a miscellaneous collection of things beautiful, touching, religious, holy—such, for instance, as are our prayer-books, pious anthologies, daily meditation books, treatises on this or that virtue. But they do form a *process*. Beginning *ab ovo* from what reason teaches about God and Providence, they advance, some connected loosely, some closely, but all leading on and up to the amelioration, the perfection of life. This is laid down by Ignatius in the very first of the Annotations, with which his *Exercises* begin.

The same thing is put another way by Father Debuchy: "Ignatius's book was a work lived first by himself and later on lived by others under his direction." It is put in yet another way by the late Mr. Orby Shipley in his Anglican days: "The *Exercises* are rather a method of spirituality than a manual of piety." It is in this that they have their claim to be singular if not unique. Of beautiful spiritual books there is an immense number, many being far more eloquent, more comforting and dignified, more pleasant and more widely instructive than the *Exercises*. But this is the only one which practically points the way how to begin to detect sins and weaknesses and how to overcome them when found, which guides a man to the Throne of Mercy, which aids him to find God's will for the future, and which settles him in the right way, so far as this is possible in our changeable world.

Ignatius then acquired experimental knowledge of all the essential parts of the *Exercises* during his stay in "la Santa Cueva" at Manresa, between March, 1522, and February, 1523. Father de Cámara says this very plainly while bringing out the saint's great earnestness in observing every special observance of the retreat. "He seems to have first planted the *Exercises* in his soul, and from actually making them, he drew out the rules about them."

He began to write then, after he had won knowledge by experience, and he presumably began at once. For, in the first place, all the biographers say that he began to do so at this time, and, secondly, he also began at once to give the *Exercises*, or some of them, to others. This would show that his thoughts were, on many points, quite mature enough to commit to paper.

How much was written down we do not know. We have already heard of the Meditations of the Life of Christ, the Rules of the Election, the Rules of the Discretion of Spirits. So the essential parts of the *Exercises* (though perhaps not in their final form) were settled even now.

In the accounts of the troubles at Alcalá, 1526, no mention is made of any "Book" of the *Exercises*. It is mentioned first in connection with Salamanca, where new troubles arose a little later, and again, a little later still, at Paris, when it was again examined and passed with honour.

Still the process of elaboration was far from finished. Father Nadal, Ignatius's secretary and intimate, says :—

After having completed his studies, the author united his first attempts of the *Exercises*, made many additions, put all into order, and presented his work for the examination and judgment of the Apostolic See.

Now that we know Ignatius's *modus operandi*, this seems all very natural. There are very few priests who will not gladly own, that their notes on ascetical subjects, made before their theological studies, are improved by being recast after their course. Ignatius's studies were over by 1537, so it was then that the great revision took place. It will have been over by 1541, for that is the year written on the first surviving Latin version, now called *Antiqua Latina*. The Papal sanction still took some time in coming. The Society itself had to be approved first, and this proved a long and serious undertaking. The commendatory brief, *Pastoralis Officii*, which now forms the introduction to the book, seems to have been applied for in 1546. It is dated 31st July, 1548. The volume was first printed in Rome that same year. The time taken over these final stages was long, but to those who know how slowly Rome proceeds in grave matters, it will not seem surprising.

No copy of the *Exercises* in Ignatius's own hand is now known, but a codex of his Spanish text is preserved, written in a secretary's hand, and containing in the saint's hand some small corrections and additions, which probably bring the text down to the stage at which it was first translated into Latin in 1541, as we have seen. This Spanish text is now styled the *Autographa*, and it was reproduced in phototype in 1908. The Spanish text was published at Rome in 1615, and has been frequently reprinted since. There has been no scientific edition hitherto, but now this text will form the groundwork of Father Cervós's volume.

Next in importance, scientifically speaking, comes the Latin version, *Antiqua Latina*, mentioned above as bearing date 1541. Père Debuchy believes that it is a translation by the author himself. Not having been edited hitherto, one must speak about it with caution. Such citations from it, however, as one meets with, show a literal and faithful rather than an elegant and polished rendering. But in the year 1541, when Rome was almost bewitched with enthusiasm for the classics, when Inigo had to change his name into Ignatius, it was too much to expect that literal fidelity would be allowed to outweigh want of classical elegance. Another Latin version was therefore made, not unfaithful, indeed, but yet putting fidelity on a lower level than classical grace. A very readable and excellent work; admirably suited to the time for which it was written, yet not so satisfying to us, with our more critical desire for the author's *ipsissima verba*. These are certainly not slavishly followed; indeed, Father Debuchy suggests that the version was possibly made from a Spanish which was not quite so far developed as the *Autographa*. We shall look forward to a discussion of this point by Father Cervós. This classical version is called the *Vulgate*, because, while the Pope's censors approved of both versions equally, it was inevitable at that time that the latter should be published, and hence its name. The *Antiqua* and the *Vulgata* will form the second and third columns, parallel with the *Autographa*.

The fourth column will be filled by Father General Roothaan's excellent Latin version from the *Autographa*. This was made in 1835, and it gave a new start to the study of the *Exercises*. Of high merit and constantly quoted, it must needs be reckoned now as indispensable.

Besides a critical edition of these four texts, the greatest of all *desiderata* for the study of the *Exercises*, Father Cervós also promises us a full introduction, in which the genesis of the volume will be scientifically treated, and amongst his supplementary papers will be the important text of Bd. Father Faber, which he left with the Carthusians of Cologne in 1546. Then there will also be several ancient *Directoria* (or Rules for giving the *Exercises*), some in the saint's own hand, with others down to the time of the publication, of the current *Directorium*, 1591, 1592.

Here it may be asked how it has come about that texts of such great importance as those here mentioned have lain, as it were, half lost all this time. An adequate answer would require a wide survey, but here it may be broadly said that the

delay has been due to the general roughness of those old combative days, when even among clerics the ardour of controversy flared up so easily and so furiously. This formed a great danger to the newly founded Society, which relied altogether on winning followers of all nations and all schools, and getting them to work together everywhere in the same way, and especially in educational matters. As very prolonged difficulties were experienced in obtaining the final sanction of the Order itself, so the necessity for concentrating on what made for unity became deeply impressed on Ignatius's mind.

Even in the *Exercises* themselves he would look only to what made for union, and when the advantages of his style were weighed against those of classical scholarship, at that day and in a teaching order, there could be no question what the general opinion would be. Ignatius's Spanish was intensely precise. Irrespective of the balance of the sentences, he added on phrase and qualification till the spiritual meaning was clear, though the stylist shuddered. To the *conoscente* indeed those characteristics will always have their charm, but they could not be imposed at will on an unappreciative generation which vehemently affected Ciceronianism. So the *Auto-grapha* was laid aside in favour of the classical *Vulgata*, although this obliterated a large number of the author's characteristic touches. To Father Roothaan is due the credit of bringing to light again these hidden treasures, and the forthcoming volume will crown his pioneer work.

Having thus briefly described the history of its composition and the chief texts, we return again to the genesis of the "*Book of the Exercises*." The official preface of the book says that they are composed "not so much from books as from the unction of the Holy Ghost." This means that the guiding providence of God, during years of prayer and study, counted for most in the work of composition. If it is said that pictures have been painted of Ignatius in the *Santa Cueva*, with the vision of Mary dictating to him as he writes, the simple answer is that an artist must choose some such device, if he wants to indicate that Mary's prayers in heaven have really been of the greatest benefit to her client's work on earth.

"Not so much from books," write the editors, which is as much as to say that some books have certainly been used, though they have not been slavishly copied. Any claim of originality so great as to preclude all use of books would convey grave dispraise of a Catholic author. But what were Igna-

tius's books? The Holy Scriptures are affirmed in the Papal brief to have been very extensively employed, and we have also heard of the great debt due to Ludolph of Saxony's *Vita Christi* in the initial stage of the composition. On the other hand, it was also inevitable that, as the author progressed he would tend to go back from Ludolph to the actual words and phrases of the New Testament, which lie so close behind the *Vita Christi*. In effect, Ignatius's references for the Meditations on Christ are always to the Evangelists, never to the Carthusian of Strasbourg.

Nevertheless, the student will come upon many a reminder of the original source. Père Watrigant, who has made the collation with care, found numerous signs of relationship. But almost all are in the *Mysteria* of the Life of Christ. Though many, they are quite short, just a stray phrase, word or idea, which recalls Ludolph,¹ though at first sight nothing else may strike the eye except a very condensed Gospel episode. *But in the essential meditations and exercises, in the sequence leading up to the "election," Ignatius does not seem to be in any way indebted to the great Carthusian.*

After Ludolph of Saxony the next author to be considered is Don Garcia de Cisneros, about whose book we have already heard the gross statement that Ignatius copied his *Exercises* from it, word for word. However absurd this extreme may be, we must not pooh-pooh all idea of indebtedness to this author. Speaking *a priori*, quite a plausible case for such indebtedness can be established: and if it were upheld, it would only bring honour to the learner. Don Garcia de Cisneros was a characteristic example of men formed in the finest Benedictine traditions. A great builder and a great ruler, he was also a writer and a founder of printing presses. Becoming abbot of Montserrat in 1493, he died in office in 1510. He printed in his monastery liturgical books for the use of the clergy and ascetical

¹ The utility of this study may be shown in the case of the passage, where Ignatius says, in an explanatory clause, that Adam was created "en el campo Damasceno" (with a capital D). All the translators, the Vulgate, Roothaan, Fathers Morris and Rickaby give this word for word, "in campo Damasceno," "in the plain of Damascus." But Watrigant shows that the phrase is a citation from Ludolph, and that the full quotation is, "in agro Damasceno juxta Hebron." Now as Hebron is in the extreme South of Palestine, and Damascus in the extreme North, "Plain of Damascus" cannot be right. The meaning must be "in the damson field near Hebron."

The large D of the *Autograph*, will show one of the many divergencies between the conventions about capital letters in those days and in our own. We write "turkey-cock," and "brussels sprouts," but "Latin grammar," "Homeric struggle." But this has only been settled lately. As readers of old books know, capitals would, a couple of centuries ago, have been used in each case.

works for the good of his monks and of other pious souls. He had taken stock of the religious writers then most in honour, SS. Bernard and Bonaventure, and other Fathers, as well as writers of his own day, especially those of the well-known school of the "Brothers of the Common Life." Of his various works the two we must keep in mind are the *Directorio de las Horas Canonicas* and the *Exercitatorio de la Vida Spiritual* (both in Spanish and Latin), published in the year 1500.

When Ignatius was on his way to Manresa, twelve years after the abbot's death, he came to his abbey, lodged probably in the hospice, and chose one of the monks, Jean Chanones, once a novice under Cisneros, for his confessor. Any child can see that we are getting what it would call "warm." Ignatius is at the very place where the *Exercitatorium Vitæ Spiritualis* was written and printed, where copies of it were dispensed gratis to poor clerics. He is under the spiritual direction of a man trained in the school of that *Exercitatorium*, and he leaves the place for the neighbouring Manresa, where he writes another book on the same subject and with a title, which agrees almost word for word with that of Cisneros. How can an ordinary man help thinking that the previously untrained Inigo drew at least as largely on Cisneros for his subject, as he seems to the eye to have done for his title.

To this one must answer that it is not licit to jump to conclusions before having taken the evidence as a whole into consideration. The rapid inference made above takes no count of two decisive arguments. First, the older and much more authoritative tradition (which has been given above) tells a story different from that of the *immediate* writing down of the *Exercises* in final form, though it attests that the essential parts existed from the first. Secondly, collation is the only true test for settling this particular point. If no quotations, parallel passages or the like are found, then there has been no borrowing. If there are some analogies, though only few and unimportant, it will not follow that the second writer has copied them from the first, *if* the common terms and ideas are also found in other books or in the general stock of religious teachers at that day.

Père Watrigant has made the collation and he shows that four Annotations, and parts of three others may have in them reminiscences of Cisneros. The title may also be a recollection, so may parts of the *Meditation on Hell*, and possibly also the frequent use of "colloquies." But then all these words and

ideas are found in other writers of the age, especially in Jean Mombaer and Gerard of Zutphen. Some of them are also in the *Imitation of Christ*, which, so his memoirs say, was practically the only book which our saint used habitually. There is not one clear citation of Cisneros in the *Exercises*, though there are so many from Ludolph.

But the most important point of all is that whereas the first recensions of the *Exercises* probably contained little more than its essentials, the sweep of *Exercises* leading up to the "election," *there is nothing at all of this sort in the Exercitatorio*. Cisneros wrote for religious persons who had already made their choice of a state of life and were intent on this or that virtue, mortification or holy practice. Of course, there were sure to be some analogies between the two books, especially in describing the early stages of spirituality. In effect it is here alone that points of likeness are found, where an entire dissimilarity between Catholic writers, especially those of the same country and epoch, can hardly be imagined.

In fixing the historical data necessary for this discussion our attention was rightly fixed on the testimonies nearest to the actual events, and these have naturally come from the Jesuits, who questioned the saint himself. Something must now be said about the later traditions of Montserrat regarding its celebrated abbot and its saintly client, who is one of its most cherished glories. There is no need here to fear any rivalry between Orders. But history does warn against another danger. There never was an age when pious fictions were more easily coined and circulated than in Spain at the end of the 16th century. At a time when Don Quixote was the jocular yet veridical representation of the country gentleman, the legends of the country sacristan can hardly be taken *per se* as gospel. Such folk, according to their wont, discovered at Monserrat a cave in which they said that Ignatius lived, clothed in the habit of a Benedictine "donat." Charminglly patriotic, of course; yet how transparently fictitious! If, then, these same late traditions further affirm that our saint studied the *Exercitatorio* of Cisneros under the guidance of Chanones, may we not prudently suspend judgment until further evidence is forthcoming? The tradition does indeed go back as far as 70 years after the visit of Ignatius. But who can help seeing that this leaves ample time for a gloss of fancy to embellish the humble germ of truth?

Dom Jean Martial Besse has not very long since written on

this tradition¹ with a superiority to prejudice which all must admire, just as we all agree with his verdict that the work of Ignatius was "*absolument original*." If he attributes more authority to the local tradition than seems to us quite critical, this is probably due to his not knowing the still older evidence of an opposite tendency lately published in the *Monumenta*, which was not accessible when he wrote. A more intimate knowledge of Ignatius's *Exercises* would also have made his comparison between the two books more convincing, though as it is, his words are already both strong and satisfying.

Some minor points in the evolution may, in conclusion, be touched upon summarily. Perhaps the most interesting of these is the problem of the "Rules for Thinking with the Church." Certainly they cannot date from the earliest days before Ignatius had lived even in the neighbourhood of a non-Catholic. On the other hand, they would agree well with his time in Paris, when men like John Calvin were members of the same University. Watrigant quotes a contemporary notice, put out by the University authority on guarding against the spread of heresy, and he suggests that this, or something like it, may have been Ignatius's original in the matter. The "Rules for Alms" evidently suggest a society where rich livings and fat preferments were common. This suggests the years of work in the Venetiano, 1537 to 1541. Ignatius himself says the method of marking the particular examen *on diminishing lines* was an afterthought, but he does not tell us where or whence that thought arose. A diligent editor, with much new material before him, will doubtless have interesting information to give us on these and kindred points. The *Anima Christi*, for instance, goes back a good way beyond Ignatius. The history of all such connections cannot but be edifying as well as educational and entertaining.

J. H. POLLEN.

¹ *Revue des questions Historiques*, January, 1897. His theory is that Chanones taught Ignatius the *Exercises* of Cisneros, and that the Saint assimilated them so thoroughly, that the resulting work was the entirely personal and original production of its writer.

"CATHOLICISM AND THE FUTURE"

IN the Literary Supplement of the *Times* for January 2nd, the first number for the New Year, this organ of public opinion gave its opening article to a long disquisition on "Catholicism and the Future." These opening articles are generally understood to be by writers of distinction, and the report is that the present article is written by an Oxford don; indeed, to judge by its contents and the special place in the framing of the future of Catholicism it assigns to Neo-Platonism, we should probably be not far wrong in the conjecture that the don in question belongs to the philosophical party which looks up to the Dean of St. Paul's as the leading source of its special inspiration. Anyhow, it is evidently intended to be used for purposes of anti-Catholic propagandism, and is worthy, therefore, of a few comments.

It takes the form of a criticism of a new book by Miss Maud Petre on Modernism or, as the writer we are referring to calls it, an obituary notice on Modernism, and it begins by an endeavour to be as nasty as possible over the action of the Holy See in condemning that movement. As is known, Pius X., in his determination to secure the Catholic populations against the deception threatened by some Modernists who expressed their intention to take Holy Orders under false pretences, thereby to obtain an advantageous position for furtively spreading Modernist doctrines among their flocks, prescribed an oath disavowing the doctrine condemned in the encyclical *Pascendi* to be taken by all teaching in Catholic colleges or Universities or entering the sacred ministry, by all receiving faculties to exercise it in any sphere or to rule in any department over houses of study where the young Levites are formed, together with some other classes. The *motu proprio* in which this was enjoined was called the *Sacrorum Antistituum*, and the regulation thus enjoined was carried out by the Bishops everywhere very sweepingly. But in Germany, where in other respects it was similarly carried out, a difficulty arose which the writer we are dealing with thus describes:—

While the anti-Modernist oath was everywhere else exacted as an essential pledge of loyalty and orthodoxy, Pius X. wrote in 1911 to the Archbishop of Cologne [Cardinal Fischer]: "In our

conversations with you, dear brother, we tolerated an exception, and admitted that priests teaching in the faculty of theology were not obliged to take the oath."

This tolerance, extended to the professors in the German Universities specified, the *Times* writer describes as "an act of complaisance to German Modernists," and sees in it a disposition to make an exception for Germany, whilst causing it to be extirpated everywhere else, a disposition which he refers to the Pope's antipathy for France and favouritism towards Germany, though the date of the Papal provision preceded the outbreak of the war which set France, Italy and England in alliance against the Central Powers. And by way of supporting this conclusion he refers to some words said by the Pope, whether Pius X. or Benedict XV., to an Italian group, to whom he said that "It is in conformity with the order established by God that there should be in human society princes and subjects, employers and proletarians, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, nobles and plebeians." He gives us no reference for this address to the Italian group, which he characterizes as an intended condemnation of the Christian Socialism which is an adjunct to Modernism, and at the same time an approval of German autocracy as opposed to French democracy. But we shall not take the pains to supply for his omission by looking up the passage, containing as it does an obvious truism which common observation as well as the utterances of many previous Popes and an infinitude of political students have over and over again announced. But as regards the writer's suggestion that Pius X. was influenced by the motive he assigns in dispensing the professors in German Universities from the anti-Modernist oath, we should like to have a few words with him. Did he, we should like to hear from him, take the reasonable pains, which he would have felt obliged to take in any other case, to find out what the nature of this dispensation was and in what way the case differed from that of the professors teaching in the ordinary Catholic seminaries? Did he take note that in the latter case the professors were appointed by the Pope himself, either immediately or mediately, that is by some form of Church authority, and in the former case they were officials appointed by the German civil state; and was it for this reason that he slurred over the words of Pius X. so misleadingly, who in his letter to Cardinal Fischer stated quite clearly that the Universities whose professors were not to be required to take the oath were such as were governed by the German Government? We

might also be disposed to ask him if he had taken the pains to consult the article in the *Tablet* for February 18th, 1911, on the *Holy See and Germany*, which explained how the controversy arose and how the German Protestants in their bigotry and intolerance had been trying to make the imposition of the anti-Modernist oath a pretext for abolishing altogether the Catholic theological faculties in the State Universities which existed there on the basis of an understanding between the Holy See and the German Government. This attempt to deprive the Catholics of the advantage attending the civil Universities by making such attendance injurious to their faith led to the subject being considered at the meeting of the German Bishops at Fulda in the autumn of 1910. It was these prelates who raised the question by asking the Holy Father if they might take the words of the *Sacrorum Antistituum*, which imposed the oath on Catholic professors in Catholic Universities, as not intended to include those who taught in the State Universities, pointing out to him how there were those at work who sought to make mischief out of the regulation, if it had to be enforced. It was to these that Pius X. replied sanctioning the interpretation which did not bind professors appointed by the State in civil Universities, in view of that not being clearly enunciated in the law as published and the desirability of not giving an unnecessary handle to those who were manœuvring to bring about a State persecution; but pointing out at the same time the importance of State professors in question being at heart in sympathy with the purpose of the oath. Hence it was that, while accepting the position that they were free not to take the oath, Pius X. in his letter to Cardinal Fischer added that "If they boast that they are glad to be able to use this permission, while it may be that they do not raise any suspicion as to the soundness of their doctrine, yet they certainly show themselves to be miserable slaves of the judgment of men and show a cowardly respect for the authority of those who, not from conviction but from hatred of the Catholic religion, are continually crying out and proclaiming that by this sworn profession of the faith the dignity of the human reason is outraged and the progress of study held in check." However, in fact, most of the German professors in question, and, we imagine, all of them eventually, used the opportunity to assure their bishops, and through them the Holy Father, that they entirely entered into the spirit which he had desired of them when he accorded that *benigna interpretatio* of the new law. On this important fact, indeed,

the *Times* writer is altogether silent, but if anyone requires the proof he may find it in another article in the *Tablet* for March 25th, 1911. For in this article the "Catholic German University Professor," who writes it explained in the following paragraph what action was taken in regard to the matter by the Catholic professors of the three principal civil Universities in Germany.

First those of the Catholic Theological Faculty of Münster in Westphalia state in a letter of January 31st (1911) to their Bishop that they had never gloried in being exempted from the oath, and were far from wishing to appear as if they thought the oath involved a change in the old foundations of their faith and theological labours. On the contrary, their teaching and their openly expressed conviction had always been in harmony with the principles of the Encyclical *Pascendi* and the oath against the Modernist dissolution of the Catholic faith. On February 4th the members of the Catholic theological faculty of Bonn declared their adhesion to the sentiments and convictions expressed by their colleagues of Münster. A little later the members of the (Catholic) theological faculty of Breslau proclaimed that the anti-Modernist oath neither implied a change of the old rule of faith always adhered to by the faculty or went beyond it; it was neither an impediment to the loyalty due to the State nor to the progress of study. When the contents of this letter were communicated to the Holy See, the Secretary of State, Cardinal Merry del Val, officially recognised, in a public letter of February 10th, that these professors of Breslau on oath had merely made use of what was, so to speak, their right, and that the Holy Father was convinced of their unbroken loyalty. Moreover he telegraphed to Cardinal Kopp that what he had written to the professors of Breslau applied to all the other professors of the Catholic theological faculties in Germany who were of the same mind as those in Breslau.

This seems to decide beyond all cavil the reasonableness and consistency of Pius X. in his dealing with this question of the Catholic professors in the German State Universities, as was, indeed, promptly pointed out by a "Catholic Layman" in the next number of the *Literary Supplement*. But these misrepresentations of Catholicism need to be corrected over and over again, and besides we have been able to add some further details which complete the correction and illustrate the carelessness of the writer in looking up his facts. We may, too, for the same reason (inasmuch as the *Times* writer assumes that the Holy See was so fierce against Modernism because it was a French theory and sought to tolerate it as soon as it appeared in a German dress) call attention to the perfectly sound con-

tention of the German writer to the *Tablet* that Modernism, as it has been formulated by Loisy and others, "had its roots in the German rationalistic philosophy of Kant and the German rationalistic Protestant criticism of the Bible." Not that this would matter or be important to notice, were it not that the *Times* writer seeks to exempt the Germans from all responsibility for its outbreak.

After having thus made a starting-point for himself out of this strange misrepresentation of the Pope's action over the German professors in the civil Universities, the *Times* writer goes on to sustain it by various incursions into the domain of Catholic history, which, however, only serve to show that, in spite of his pretensions to the contrary, his knowledge of Catholic history is extraordinarily inaccurate and superficial. To take some of the points that illustrate this, the writer tells his readers that the Papacy was not originally so despotic, as he calls it, but succumbed to the gradual influence according to which "all autocracies tend to become more despotic and centralised" as times goes on. His first proof of this is of the most singular kind: "Innocent III. declared explicitly that the judgment of the Church may be erroneous. Thus a man may be condemned by God who is held guiltless by the Church, or he may be condemned by the Church but be held guiltless by God." Just so, but he adds that this is a doctrine which in the mouth of a modern Catholic would be considered "flat rebellion." No, indeed, it would not. The writer is only exhibiting his slipshod method of reading what he finds in Catholic books. He has not noticed that in the passage which he has quoted the Pope is referring to the case in which there is question of the interior motives of the person whose case is judged by the authorities of the Church. The Church can judge with certainty of the value of propositions, these being external facts which come within her competence. But only God can judge with certainty of the interior motives of the person whose action is under examination, and so the Church authority, like any other human authority, though it is generally safe in its reliance on the data furnished by the human testimony, may absolutely fall into error, and at times does. Presently, relying on this and similar "proofs" that the Church in later ages became more and more despotic, he sets down to this cause the action of the Holy See in dealing with certain crises which sprang up in its path. "The iron uniformity of Roman discipline crushed out in succession Jansenism, Gallicanism, Febronianism, and,

finally, Modernism; it alienated science, humanism and the humanitarian movements associated with democracy; thus losing all the growing forces of the present time." This is one of those imposing statements self-confidently asserted on which your wordmonger relies to impress his readers. But when one takes it to pieces, to what does it come? Jansenism, Gallicanism and Febronianism were theories which, after exhaustive examination, were proved to be without any historical foundation and destructive, the first of the true spirituality of the faith, the other two of the orderly government of the Church on the lines which our Lord had laid down for it. If, after such antecedents, it appears to a writer like the one we are concerned with that to proceed to an authoritative condemnation must spell despotism, it must be because he is an upholder of ecclesiastical anarchy. We say nothing here of Modernism, as we shall have in a moment the writer himself acknowledging that in condemning it the Holy See did only what was unavoidable. If by its action in these later ages the Holy See alienated science it was only a kind of science which, whilst pretending to the name, went far beyond real scientific achievements, and claimed acceptance for many scientific theories which have, most of them, had since to be abandoned. The notion that the Holy See has in any way impeded the study of science among her members is altogether unfounded, and proceeds not from really scientific students but from the impatient advocates of undigested novelties. By humanism, in the words quoted, the writer means pragmatism, and we are free to admit that the Catholic authorities have set their face against that, and rightly, but they have always been leaders in the cause of humanity, and that long before democracy became popular or influential as a theory of government, perhaps, too, on sounder principles than modern democracy is apt to cover with its ægis. Nor, again, have they ever opposed themselves to the intervention of the laity in the promotion of Catholic progress, provided that intervention be in conformity with Catholic principles, and, indeed, they have known throughout how to get most valuable co-operation from the laity in that way. But what the *Pascendi* calls, or rather what this writer makes the *Pascendi* call, "the doctrine which would make the laity a factor of progress in the Church," is the strange doctrine that there is and ought to be a contest continually going on between the clergy and the laity, the laity ever urging the claims of the newest theories of the day, and urging that for the Church to refuse them admission into its

creed is to oppose itself to the right of their consciences, whilst the clergy should keep up resistance to these claims in the interests of adherence to the Church's tradition, the struggle continuing on the principle of "pull devil pull baker" till one or the other prevails, the sympathy of the writer being ever with the laity, that is, with those who represent his own views. One more notion of this writer's which is asserted in this part of his article requires a word of comment, for he declares with conviction that in the *Pascendi* "the doctrine of the inner light which had been the foundation of all orthodox Catholic mysticism is handed over by it to Protestant and pseudo-mysticism." One wonders how the writer got this notion into his head, so contrary is it to the facts. Catholicism throughout has held that by the light of reason the human mind can arrive at the knowledge of the existence and of some of the attributes of God by inference from the facts of the visible world, as the Book of Wisdom teaches, but that he can have no immediate knowledge of these truths by light of nature, although in rare cases he receives supernatural knowledge of some portion of them by private revelation when raised to the mystic state. This private revelation may be what the writer misleadingly calls, borrowing the term from Puritan theology, an "inner light," but then, if he would be accurate, he should know that the Catholic Church never allows this inner light to be accepted as a test by which to judge of the public revelation made from the first to the Apostles, but on the contrary requires that the propriety of this inner light itself should be tested by its accordance or non-accordance with the tradition of the Church.

From these instances it can be gathered how untrustworthy is this writer as a source of information in regard to matters bearing on the doctrines and methods of the Catholic system. But, after thus devoting two of his columns to a contention on these lines that the Catholic Church displayed its despotism in resisting the programme of the Modernists and condemning it, he makes a sudden turn and devotes his remaining three and a half columns to proving that that Church could not reasonably have been expected to do otherwise by finding a place for Modernism in her system, and to explaining in his own way what is likely to be the future before her and sketching it in such a way as to bear some resemblance of probability. This, indeed, is incoherence, but who would deny to one, who claims the right of attacking Catholicism without inquiring into the facts concerning her, the kindred right to be incoherent in his

criticisms of her system. At the same time we cannot find the space to follow him into this new department of his imaginative effort. We must confine ourselves to the briefest of comments on its character. To begin with, he inverts altogether his attitude towards Modernism on the ground that "institutions must grow out of their own roots, and it is impossible to graft upon the stem a plant of alien nature." So far, indeed, he is quite right. Modernism and Catholicism are plants of as alien a nature as is well conceivable, though when he goes on to derive the alien nature of Catholicism in regard to Modernism from its being "an amalgamation of Jewish prophetism brought to final perfection in the ministry of the Founder and the later Platonism which has gathered up into itself the fruits of eight hundred years of Hellenic thought," and finds that these diverse elements had "formed very quickly together an organic compound," he again strays not only from the historic facts but from all reasonable probabilities—though it must be added he thereby furnishes the data which have made us suspect an affinity between the philosophic parentage of his article and the well-known Neo-Platonic conceptions of the Dean of St. Paul's. He seems, however, nearer to the truth when he anticipates that the great enemy of Catholicism in the near future will be Socialism, but that the domination of this is not likely to last for "economic Socialism will receive a severe check when no more wealth is available for seizure, and the 'comrades' discover that the State, which is to do everything for them means not 'my neighbour' but 'myself.'" There would then be a renaissance when the disillusionment of Europe was complete. It would be religious, humanistic, international, and probably hierarchical. Would it, he asks, find a resting-place in the Catholic Church? He thinks it might, though he is not certain. To us, however, it seems certain that it will, though we have better grounds to reckon by than has this writer, namely, the grounds furnished by the words of our Lord that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her," words which have received a manifold experimental confirmation under the many crises through which that Church has passed during the long course of history, crises when the near approach of her destruction was confidently predicted, but proved only to be the precursor of some new period of renaissance and renewal. The writer, indeed, conceives himself to be safe in predicting that such a renaissance can be anticipated only if the Catholic Church is able to make its peace with science. But

he need not be anxious about that. The Catholic Church, unlike some other bodies that might be cited, has always taken up an impregnable position in regard to science, for she has always distinguished carefully between the established facts of science and the floating theories concerning their origin or explanation, theories the broaching of which may be right enough at the time, but absolute acceptance of which is usually premature.¹

S. F. S.

¹ See on this point Sir Bertram Windle's *Facts and Theories* (C.T.S.).

IN CHURCH

THE evening falls
 As fell the mystic hour in Nazareth,
 Peace upon peace—and Thou with quiet breath
 Leaning on Mary's heart, a tired child,
 Dost Thou remember how she sang and smiled
 And kissed Thy Hands, Thy Brow? while in the West
 The great Day, sad and splendid, went to rest?

Ah wearied, spent,
 Held in the strait bonds of Thy Sacrament,
 Look on the western window's flooding gold,
 Its ardent jewels, splendours manifold!
 Colours of grass, of corn, of seas awake,
 The stars of Heaven molten for Thy Sake
 Burn, glory unto glory, that Thine Eyes
 May liken earth to sun-swept Paradise.
 Listen again—the wind of our desire
 Beats on the panes, the quivering panes on fire.

Black mournful night
 The writhing vine, the knotted olive tree
 And the wild darkness of Gethsemane.
 Dost Thou remember how Thy Lips were set
 And how the grass and shivering leaves were wet?
 Burden of anguish, pain, and presage dread
 The Vision of the Living and the Dead,
 The earth a-shake and cold, the Heavens stark
 And Thy great Angel weeping in the dark?

From midnight street
Come echoes of the lagging sinful feet.
Does Thy Heart ache? But raise Thine eyes and see
The stately darkness we have made for Thee,
And how our forest-trees of glimmering stone
Join all their boughs to hold Thee for our Own,
While, swinging low, unfailing lamps are set
The Seven Stars, crimson and violet.
Oh, contrite-warm our fragile flowers rain
Their scarlet blooms in memory of Thy pain
Within the Garden. Though we wake or sleep
Still do our hearts a loyal vigil keep.

The Day is here
Walking with silver sandals on the sea,
As once unto the waves of Galilee
Came the glad morning,—and Thy Sons were spent,
Aching with fruitless labour, ill-content
Lacking Thy presence. Then unto the shore
They saw Thee come,—they saw Thee come once more
And Thou went with them to console and bless
Spreading their table in the wilderness.

We come to Thee,
Weary and famished for the mystery,
And Thou art waiting and the Feast is spread
Upon the Altar,—Wine and Stainless Bread.
Is this a wilderness? For Thee t'was laid
Our marble floor chequered with light and shade!
And here are hangings dipped in precious dyes,
Silver and bronze and deep embroideries.
Not here the unfaith that dimmed Thy mortal days
But *Pange Lingua* and the song of praise.
Oh—of our griefs the Balm, of joys the Sum
Hold out Thy Hands—Thy Sons and Daughters come!

M. G. CHADWICK.

THE VISION

"And there's no end to voyaging,
When once the call is heard,
For the seas call and the stars call
And oh! the call of a bird."

GERALD GOULD.

MR. JENKINS, confidential clerk, shut the door of the senior partner's room behind him with exactly the necessary degree of firmness seasoned with respect.

Outside in the passage he paused a moment, staring at the floor and smiling a little, though the hand which still held the shiny black knob of the door was trembling and his face was very white. A clerk hurrying down the passage saw him standing there and wondered, so clear was the look of tense expectancy in the man's face, whether "old Jenks" had been "fired." The passing of the youth, however, roused Mr. Jenkins from his momentary abstraction. He drew a hurried little breath; at the same moment the strident notes of a barrel-organ floated down the passage and reached his horror-struck ears. Mr. Jenkins frowned; then, as the rollicking tune swung down towards him between the brown office walls, liltingly reminiscent of open spaces and the ecstasy of dancing feet, he walked away in search of the offending boy who had dared to leave the main doors open and thus allow the intrusion of unseemly melody into the premises of Messrs. Simmonds & Thring, Solicitors and Commissioners for Oaths.

At the doorway Mr. Jenkins paused. The office boy was on the pavement revolving to the "music," his arms clasped strenuously about the diminutive figure of the organ grinder's daughter. A little monkey in a crimson coat sat motionless on the top of the instrument, its wide eyes looking apparently straight into infinity; a woman passing with a great basket of lilac and daffodils stopped to listen and the sudden sweetness came to Mr. Jenkins almost like a touch. "Orange and green and crimson," he said to himself. "My God! And all in Chancery Lane."

The boy lost step, recovered himself and swung round more rapidly, the little elfin figure in his arms as light as thistledown on the grey pavement; the monkey, with a vindictive chatter, came back from eternity and transferred his attention to the more immediate problem of the uninvited inhabitants who shared his furry coat. Then the music stopped, and the boy

flung himself, panting, up the steps. "Wonder what's the game," he ruminated, peering in through the solid plate-glass doors which, heavily insured, gave access to the sanctuary of Messrs. Simmonds & Thring. "Never knowed old Jenks not come down on a feller like a ton o' bricks before, even when you ain't doin' nuffin, neither. Any w'y, it was a decent 'op."

* * * * *

The long afternoon had dragged itself out at length, and Mr. Jenkins found himself descending the stone stairs for the last time. He had said "Good-bye" to the senior partner with a fairly successful effort to maintain a professional demeanour. The chief had turned away then to answer a telephone call; when he looked up again at Mr. Jenkins fastening up envelopes on the other side of the big table there had been an almost imperceptible hesitation in his manner.

"By the way, Jenkins," he said, "you have not forgotten that the auditors will be here to-morrow? I suppose the books and accounts are ready as usual."

Mr. Jenkins hurriedly removed his tongue from the flap of the envelope in hand at the moment. "Yes, sir," he said, "and the accountant tells me that everything is posted and in order up to the end of the month."

"And you are still determined not to tell me why you are leaving us after forty years?"

Mr. Jenkins flushed. "I—I can't, sir, at the moment," he said, painfully. "But I will write and tell you, if I may afterwards."

"Oh! of course, of course," said the other, reaching for his hat and gloves. He was a little nettled by Mr. Jenkins' refusal to explain his movements. The reserved, quiet man had been his own confidant in more than one personal or professional dilemma, and the whole thing, Jenkins' unaccountable departure and his uncommunicativeness, annoyed and distressed the senior partner; something, too, in Mr. Jenkins' eyes, a queer elusive radiance, had made him feel uncomfortable, almost ashamed.

When the chief had gone Mr. Jenkins made his way downstairs. The office was deserted now save for the caretaker's cat, who came and rubbed himself ingratiatingly against Mr. Jenkins' legs; the soft furry warmth of its circling body somehow comforted a vague aching in his soul, and he deposited a little shame-faced kiss between the creature's immense yellow eyes.

Outside, the living brilliance of the afternoon had faded to a softer atmosphere of pearl and silver; above the crowding roofs the spring sky showed clear and tender as the eyes of a child; Mr. Jenkins, mounted on the top of a motor 'bus, looked down upon the homeward-moving people as if from a throne. Close against his heart lay a little packet tied with a red ribbon and carefully sealed. The prosaic covering, a blue-grey bank envelope, concealed a quantity of crisp new notes, £400 in all. The little weight of them which Mr. Jenkins could feel as he breathed was warm and thrilling, the symbol of his release.

Swiftly the 'bus bore him on—past the grey Law Courts and the pulsing hurry of Charing Cross to the wider spaces of Trafalgar Square and a long vista of St. James' Park, blue-grey against a primrose sky. The tide of excitement was rising in his soul. He was no longer "old Jenks," the trusted servant of one of the oldest established firms of solicitors in the City. He had done with deeds and documents and vegetarian lunches and typewriters and the heaped sins of office boys; had done with the grey sameness of interminable days lived behind a wire blind; with ledgers and filing cabinets and impatient clients and telephones; he had even dispensed with the officialdom of cheques for the moment, for did not the bulk of his capital now lie in crackling newness, warm and human, close above his quickly beating heart? "To-morrow," said Mr. Jenkins steadily to himself as the 'bus swayed down Whitehall and gave him a fleeting glimpse of the river, white-flecked below Westminster Bridge, "and the day after and all the to-morrows after that, until I die, I shall be free."

Then his mind refused to visualize the future, going back instead to sun-steeped memories of green-blue seas and purple heather. He could see the cottage set beneath a Cornish wheatfield and the flagged path by which lilac grew and a syringa bush, white and beautiful against the grey stone wall. It was behind the lilacs that he had hidden in sudden, soul-shaking terror on the spring morning when four men had carried his father's drowned body up the steep cliff path and laid it on the bed.

The memory of the days that followed was close about him now as the 'bus swung on down Victoria Street towards the deepening radiance of the sunset, flung and growing across a pearl and primrose sky. It seemed to Mr. Jenkins that the world was full of colour, very pure and clear. The scent of the sea came mingled with the street and petrol smells about him;

the swift movement of the 'bus was no longer that of a wheeled vehicle but the steady rhythm of a ship, wind-driven towards sapphire harbours islanded in gold and lights set beaconnise beneath uncharted stars. The years of servitude had slipped from him one by one, and little, half-forgotten lovelinesses had come creeping back into the corners of his middle-aged mind.

He had suffered most at first when he and his mother had migrated from the west to London, helped by the kindly offices of Mr. Simmonds, who had been staying in the village at the time of the accident. The solicitor had offered the boy a place in his office, thinking to give him a "good start in life." Neither he nor the boy's mother had realised what the changed conditions of existence and thought had meant to the fisherman's son, though he had "settled down," outwardly, at least, with commendable diligence and docility. There had been, too, long spaces in his life when the vision had been almost blotted out by months lived face to face with respectable poverty; not starvation, tragic and gaunt-ribbed, walking stumbingly in outer darkness with sunken eyes, but the grey fog of perpetual insufficiency—green-seamed clothing and little pawnings and redeemings, with the fear of life more heart-shaking than the swift terror and majesty of any panoplied death.

Of women he had known nothing, save through his mother, until a girl typist at the office, fair skinned and radiant-haired, had been blown, as it were, like some stray flower, into the passionate, secret places of his heart. For some months then it had seemed that the days had flamed themselves away, each one lit and tremulous at the sweet brilliance of her eyes. They had walked on spring evenings on what Mr. Jenkins' reason told him was a grey stretch of hard pavement known to common men as the "Embankment," but which appeared to him like a pathway bordered with asphodel that led above a tideless river straight to the heart of colour and of love. There had been afternoons, too, set like jewels "for remembrance" in the green spaces of Richmond or Kew, and magic summer twilights at Earl's Court Exhibition among the queer, enchanting presentations of foreign lands and peoples, warm and brilliant beneath the stars.

They had gone also, Mr. Jenkins a little shocked at his own temerity, into dim churches where red lights or golden burned perpetually before the new Bethlehem—"the little House of Bread." For the girl was a Catholic, and longed to share with

her young lover the vision she had known from infancy. They had spent once a long time before what Mr. Jenkins had by then learned to no longer call "an idol" of Our Lady, Star of the Sea—a little ancient statue of the Mother of God holding her Son towards all who came, her robes more blue than larkspur, against a background of pearl-grey. As Mr. Jenkins and his companion turned to go a sudden impulse seized him. Blushing furiously, he extracted a penny from his pocket and dropped it hurriedly into a box beside which leaned a heap of candles. The descent of the coin and the striking of a match which followed seemed to fill the building with an immensity of noise that was almost terrifying; Mr. Jenkins was thankful that the church was so dark. Then, as the first candle he had ever lighted in a Popish place flamed into brilliance across Our Lady's face and eyes, he knelt before her, the girl beside him, and showed her without words the old and the new vision of his yet untutored soul.

The end had come quite suddenly and unexpectedly. The girl had been away for her short yearly holiday when Mr. Jenkins, counting the hours to her return, had received a curt little letter simply stating that she had changed her mind and intended marrying another man.

* * * * *

Mr. Jenkins roused himself with a little start. The 'bus had swung round into Lower Sloane Street with a jerk, and a stale smell of dust rose in little eddies; it seemed to him that the colour of the world was faded and old. He had only once seen the woman he had loved, years after the coming of the letter; her husband had disappeared, leaving wife and child penniless to face the world alone. The boy, a clever lad of fifteen, had been received into Mr. Simmonds' office, and, with Mr. Jenkins' help and interest, had attained now to a position of some trust there.

Swifter and swifter the 'bus raced on, swaying down the long reaches of the King's Road like a creature intoxicated with the joy of movement and the soft rush of the spring wind; almost, it seemed to Mr. Jenkins, that the sea must be in sight. He had booked no passage for the morrow, but intended to take his modest baggage to the docks and there to deposit it on any vessel bound for a port whose name should answer the singing in his soul. £400 and a little more in the bank would last a long time at sea. Beyond that he neither knew nor cared,

craving only the blue-grey waste of waters, cloud-shadowed, and the smell of ships.

The 'bus stopped again, and Mr. Jenkins drew a long breath ; " World's End ! " called the conductor, as Mr. Jenkins hopped on to the pavement with a feeling of relief. He was glad that his alighting place to-night should bear so significant a name, holding indeed the wideness of space and air and stars.

His landlady met him on the doorstep. " Gen'leman to see you, sir," she said. " E's been waiting arf an hour and more." Mr. Jenkins smiled. The words conveyed little to him ; he mounted the linoleum-covered stairs slowly ; they were full of shadows, mean and menacing. At a door set partly open on the half-landing he paused, then, with a little effort, put his head in and looked round. The room was empty now, and the faint, sickly smell of disease which had haunted it during all the three years that his mother had lain there dying of cancer, very white and quiet in a horror of pain, had gone too ; a sudden scurry of fresh wind blew through and swayed the door against his hand. He shut it softly and went up to his own room close beneath the roof. Before the empty grate stood the son of the woman Mr. Jenkins still loved. For a moment neither spoke ; something in the young man's eyes, so like hers and yet strangely different, froze the words on Mr. Jenkins' lips. He shut the door carefully behind him, hearing as he did so the soft rustling of the bank notes close against his heart.

" Well," said Mr. Jenkins, cheerfully, at last, " I'm glad you've come, though, of course, it means that you have discovered what I'm going to do to-morrow." He laughed, pointing to a cabin trunk bearing on a green label the words " Jenkins. Passenger to ——" The line intended for the traveller's destination was blank and empty—almost he had written " To the World's End."

The boy faced round with a start, but his eyes looked beyond Mr. Jenkins as he stood there, middle-aged and rather faded, in the centre of the room.

" Then," said the young man, unsteadily, " it'll be all right. My God ! They'll probably think——"

Mr. Jenkins looked at him in amazement. " What's up ? " he asked. The boy's eyes came back furtively from the opposite wall. " Do you mean to say," he said, " that you haven't heard ? I mean about the money that's missing at the office that the auditors'll spot to-morrow ? All the fellows have been wondering about you leaving after all these years, and—and——"

He ended with a little laugh, then swung round to the window. Mr. Jenkins stood stock still and listened to the beating of his own heart, monstrous in the silence of the room; then horror, blind and beating with webbed hands, leapt at him and he took a step forward. Presently he heard his own voice speaking from a distance, and wondered that it sounded so completely self-possessed.

"How much is missing?" said Mr. Jenkins, steadily. He knew the answer long before it came, and waited almost with indifference for the boy to speak, acutely conscious all the time of the green label on his trunk with its empty destination line. "Passenger," said Mr. Jenkins. "Passenger—passenger."

Then he heard the boy's voice, very young and clear. "Four hundred pounds," it said.

From down the street came suddenly the swift fluting of an imprisoned thrush, the incarnate voice of spring; a little wind, velvet-footed but passionately alive, crept in and stirred the hair on Mr. Jenkins' temples. He moved forward till he could see the marshalling of purple shadows and where, infinitely remote and clear, had flamed out the first white star. "Tell me how it happened," he said.

The boy faced him trembling, the whiteness of the knuckles showing on his clenched hands.

"It would be better to talk it out," said Mr. Jenkins. "There is plenty of time."

He sat down on the trunk while the persistent, clear calling of the thrush seemed to fill the dingy room with beauty, full and living; the street noises came up through a softness of pearl and amber that rounded their sharp ugliness almost into peace.

Then the boy began to speak, with long pauses, during which Mr. Jenkins sat with his short-sighted eyes staring straight in front of him. It was the pitiful smallness of the tale that made it horrible in his ears. Had the boy come with some story of passionate crime or hot-blooded insurrection he could have forgiven him for the sake of the young vision and shining desire that were still alive in his own heart. Then the next words woke anguish, swift and flaming; he stood up with a little jerk.

"Mother," said the boy, "of course knows nothing. That has been my difficulty—to keep the whole thing away from her."

Mr. Jenkins faced him almost stupidly. "I don't understand," he said.

"Don't you see?" said the other, steadily. "How could I tell her that I knew where my father was? She had believed he was dead for months past now. He used to come to me for money for—all sorts of things. I took it from the office to—keep him quiet. I thought I could return it all in time."

Mr. Jenkins drew a little hard breath that seemed as if it would strangle him; there was sweat on his forehead though his hands were like ice.

"And now?" he asked.

The boy made a gesture as if he were warding off something with his open hands.

"He was found drowned this morning on the Cornish coast," he said.

Mr. Jenkins went over to the window and leaned up against the sill; he was trembling and his throat was dry. Down the street came once more the little, velvet-footed wind, child of those larger currents that drive from continent to continent across the world; behind it there sounded to Mr. Jenkins' ears the surging thunder, strong and steady, of illimitable seas.

Then, all at once, something at his heart, very warm and living, moved and was still again.

He held out his hand to the boy. "It's all right," he said. "I'll square the four hundred pounds."

* * *

Half an hour later, with the definite coming of the London night, the thrush had ceased to call and beat its feathered breast against the bars. Mr. Jenkins sat alone by the window while the violet darkness was being pierced through with stars; the bank envelope no longer lay against his heart. Instead he could see, white-flung against the dusky tablecloth, the letter which the boy had brought. The radiance Mr. Simmonds had noticed earlier in the day was all about his face and eyes as he watched it lying there—only the second letter he had ever had from her.

Then, with a little quick catching of his breath, he got up and crossed the room, stumbling as he went against the sharp corner of the cabin trunk. For a moment he hesitated, listening intently to the long rush and swell of grey water, and the stinging signals, personal and imperious, of unprisoned winds; then he stooped and carefully scraped the green label off the trunk.

The little scratching noise of the penknife seemed to fill the room, and the sound of a gramophone from the public-house at

the corner came raucously across the shining silence of the dusk-steeped air.

Mr. Jenkins gave himself a shake and stood up hurriedly ; his fingers were sticky and cold. Then, as he noticed on the shadowy mantelpiece the glimmering dial of a dilapidated clock, the sea sounds receded, and love, ageless and utterly complete, came flooding back into his middle-aged heart. He took the clock down with a little laugh and set the alarum for 6.30, the hour which had always ensured his arrival at the office in good time before the chief. Then he took up the letter from the table and put it in the place where the bank envelope had lain against his heart.

M. E. NORRY.

EX UMBRIS IN VERITATEM

SCARCE do I Love Thee, LORD ; this vagrant heart
Leaves Thee, allured by beauty of a day ;
This dim-lit brain, so over-clogged with clay,
Knows of Thy truth and good too small a part :
These eyes, that now the high noon blinds, lack art
To see Thy loveliness beneath the ray ;
These lips but stammer words : I cannot pray,
Nor speed aloft to Heaven an unplumed dart.

But when Death comes to rive my prison bars,
And set an exiled, captive spirit free,
That mighty flame, unleashed, will quench the stars,
And Love will feel, to utter half the things
That fire its pulse, it needs eternity,
And infinite space to spread immortal wings.

K. M. MURPHY.

THE GERMAN CENTRE PARTY— PAST AND PRESENT

ONE of the first results of the German Revolution within the Empire was the dissolution, or at least considerable loosening, of the federal bond which held all the states together. The reasons are not difficult to discover. Since 1870 Germany, although in name and outward appearance a Federal State (*Bundesstaat*), has been in fact a collection of states under a Prussian domination which was often hardly tolerated, particularly by Bavaria, but was always real and always present. The armistice of November 11th, 1918, signified Prussia's failure; more than this, it involved all the other German states in the hard consequences of her aggression. Long pent-up dissatisfaction and fear of impending punishment, both interested and more or less disinterested motives, caused the movement away from Berlin which, when Bolshevism began to show itself more plainly there, was intensified in the more conservative and democratic South and Rhineland—for Bolshevism is at once the enemy of tradition and democracy.

Another result, due partly to the foregoing, partly to general factors, was the transformation—outward at least—of the great German parties. The German people are largely fatalists. Unlike the French and British, they early recognise and resign themselves to the inevitable. This is why the departure of the Emperor and Kings and the break up of the Federal Constitution were so calmly acquiesced in, even by the Conservatives. This is not equivalent to saying that Monarchism is dead in Germany, but it finds no place at present in any of the party programmes which have been issued during the past two months in the expectation of the National Assembly. These in general show a resignation to the new democratic principles of equal and universal franchise and an acknowledgment of the republican form of government. As a sign of the inner changes alterations have been made in the names of the parties. Thus, in the greater part of Germany the Conservatives, with the Free Conservatives and certain Conservative National Liberals, have become the German National Party. The National Liberals and Progressives have become the German Democratic Party; the Socialists remain as they were—divided into Majority, under

Ebert, Independents under Haase, and Spartacus Group until lately under Liebknecht. The Centrum, most interesting of all by reason of its history and detailed character of its new programme, has become the Christian Democratic People's Party—in Bavaria simply the Bavarian People's Party. Should Germany not be given over to Bolshevism but enter upon an era of representative government, the probabilities are that the Centre will emerge from the crisis in a stronger position than before. On it, more perhaps than any other party, will depend the stability of Germany and the direction of her policy for some years to come. It may, therefore, at this turning-point in its development, be of interest to look back over the history of the German Centrum and attempt to deduce therefrom its future influence and policy.

Common political action among German Catholics dates from about 1830, when the Liberals first attempted concerted attacks on the rights of the Church. But it was not until 1848, the year of revolutions, that any positive programme made its appearance. This was at the time of the Rhineland elections for the National Assembly, when the Catholic leaders of Cologne issued a list of demands and recommendations. These were of an extremely democratic tendency, including demands for direct and equal suffrage, with secret ballot, ministerial responsibility and universal military service for defence against foreign aggression and preservation of the nation's constitutional rights. Among the religious demands were those for unrestricted freedom of conscience and worship and the independence of the Church from the State—this last because of the danger of revolutionary State dictatorship. This peril, was, however, a transitory one; order was restored, and eventually the Constitution of December, 1848, in framing which the Catholic leader, Peter Reichensperger, had a considerable share, was granted and sworn. In this was to be found little trace of the democratic formulæ earlier adopted by the Catholic leader of Cologne; Catholic political orientation turned against wide parliamentary government.

The years 1852 to 1861 were remarkable for the number of party-political experiments undertaken in Prussia. In 1861, for example, was founded the Prussian Progressive Party (*Fortschrittspartei*), forerunner of the German Progressive Party. At about the same time the labouring classes, under Lassalle's leadership, were increasing in political consciousness. During the period mentioned there were two or three

attempts to establish a Catholic political party, none of which was, however, destined to be successful for long. In 1852, for example, the first Catholic Party (*Katholische Fraktion*) was formed by about fifty Catholic members, including seventeen priests, in the Prussian Diet. It lasted only four years; no common platform could be found for it except the religious confession of its adherents, and this was not sufficient to unite them in positive political action. In 1860 a revival of the party, calling itself this time "Fraktion des Centrums," was successfully made, but the new organisation collapsed in 1867. Soon afterwards reappeared on the scene Peter Reichen-sperger, who, in the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* for June 11th, 1870, proposed united political action for Catholics in defence of the Church's constitutional privileges and the federal principle as expressed in the Constitution of the North German Confederation, and in an effort to secure decentralised and popular administration, with a reduction of the military burden of the country. This programme was taken up, and, with few alterations or additions, adhered to by various Catholic conferences, notably those of Essen and Soest. The latter, it may be pointed out, added a paragraph calling for the defence of the middle and peasant classes and for the formation of the whole of Germany into a federation.

The latter demand was realised at about the same time as the German Centre Party as we know it to-day came into existence. In March, 1871, the elections to the first Reichstag were held, and as a result sixty-seven Centre Party representatives entered the new Imperial Diet. One of these was the great German Catholic Ludwig Windthorst, who, as a Hanoverian, was opposed to Bismarck and the predominance of Prussia, but allowed these principles to be overcome.

The constitution of the new party, which with few changes has remained practically the same from that day to this, declared for the federal principle of the Empire, with strict maintenance of the rights of the individual states, for civil and religious freedom and respect for the rights of religious communities. In contradistinction to the old "*Katholische Fraktion*," the Centre Party, in name at least, was interconfessional, that is, it admitted non-Catholics. But in practice it has always been a party of Catholics, not a Catholic Party, since that would imply union with the Church organisation. Its development in the German Empire is shown in the

following table of its electoral strength at various elections :—¹

<i>Date of Election.</i>	<i>Votes.</i>	<i>Number of Deputies.</i>
March 3rd, 1871 ...	718,348	67
January 10th, 1874 ...	1,438,792	91
January 10th, 1877 ...	1,344,415	93
July 30th, 1878 ...	1,316,599	94
October 27th, 1881 ...	1,177,033	100
October 28th, 1884 ...	1,282,006	99
February 21st, 1887 ...	1,516,222	99
February 20th, 1890 ...	1,342,113	106
June 15th, 1893 ...	1,468,501	96
June 16th, 1898 ...	1,455,139	101
June 16th, 1903 ...	1,875,273	100
January 25th, 1907 ...	2,190,976	105
January 12th, 1912 ...	1,991,000	90

Behind these figures lies a very varied history. It is obvious that a party, drawing its support from all classes, workers, peasants, shopkeepers, landowners, all with only one thing in common—their religion and the moral principles which that implied—would need to be opportunist, changing its policy according to circumstances. Political parties, so far as they are freely elected, reflect class interests rather than religious or moral principles. The Centre Party, demanding the adherence of all German Catholics, has never been able—though it has often attempted—to represent one class interest. It has also, particularly during the war, shown a singular variety of interpretation in its positive religious or moral conceptions. Negatively, defensively, on the other hand, it has always been united. This was notably the case in the first years of its life when Bismarck's great attack on the Church, the so-called "Kulturkampf," was triumphantly repelled by the Centre Party and German Catholics generally, whose courage and devotion will never be forgotten or underestimated by Catholics anywhere. In its resistance, successfully accomplished in most of the German states except Saxony, to such remnants of the "Kulturkampf" as the anti-Jesuit laws, the Centre has also marched with unity and persistence. It is when it approaches

¹ Taken from J. Meerfeld: *Die deutsche Zentrumspartei* (1918). This and *Deutschlands politische Parteien* (1912), by Hermann Rehm, though both are by non-Catholics—Meerfeld is a Social Democratic member of the Reichstag—have been of considerable assistance. The standard history of the Centre is that by Herr Erzberger, *Das deutsche Zentrum* (1912).

general political problems of no direct religious implications that the heterogeneity of its policy comes to the surface. The forerunners of the Centre were, as we have seen, democratically inclined. Then, partly with a view to conciliating King Frederick William IV., partly as a result of the influence of the more conservative Westphalian nobility, as opposed to the democratic Rhinelanders, it changed its direction until Count Hertling, in a speech on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the foundation of his party, could say, "The Centre Party did not wish to be a party of opposition; its founders were Conservatives."

And yet there was a period, from 1877 to 1893, when the party was, in fact, in opposition. In these years it distinguished itself, in particular, by its anti-militarist attitude. This refusal to support the Berlin Government in its policy of increase of armaments was dictated by a variety of reasons. First, by a moral aversion from the militarist spirit; secondly, by the anti-Prussianism traditional in the party; thirdly, by a spirit of opposition to the excessive industrialisation of the country which great armaments both implied and produced. The Catholic principle, the federal principle, the middle-class and peasant principle, all three lay behind this fairly consistent anti-militarist policy. More than once the Reichstag had to be dissolved because of the Centre Party votes cast against the Army Bills and a Centre electoral appeal of 1893 contained an appeal against the transformation of Germany into "a *Militarstaat*, a camp for a standing army in times of peace."

This same year, however, marked the beginning of a change. On this occasion the party voting had not been unanimous; twelve members, chiefly from the Catholic nobility, had voted the Army credits. The Centre had also acquired a new leader, —Lieber— with a determination to end the opposition character of the party. Under him it was to vote the Army credits and become in general a Government-supporting group. This complaisance, it is true, was not uninterrupted. We recall the Centre's championship of the Alsace-Lorrainers, its fierce opposition to the Government's measures against the Poles in Posen, particularly in 1906, and the opposition of certain of its members, particularly Herr Erzberger, to colonial misrule in 1912 and the military proposals of 1913. These are exceptions to the rule which has been that the Centre inclined to support the Government, on terms, except when the rights of the Church seemed to be threatened by it or the position preju-

diced of favoured sections of the Centre electorate, such as the peasantry.

The dualism in the Centre ranks which this summary history reveals was complicated by another of a sharper kind. We refer to the great dispute between Berlin and Cologne as to the true basis of the party and its political tactics. By its constitution, as has been said, the party was interconfessional. In 1907 a group of Centre politicians, led by Dr. Julius Bachem, Editor of the two great German Catholic periodicals *Historische-Politische Blätter* and the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, began to urge, notably in an article by Bachem himself, entitled "Wir müssen von dem Turm heraus" (We must leave the Tower, *i.e.*, the exclusively Catholic Centre), the practical realisation of the party's interconfessionalism in a closer co-operation with other parties. This demand, which sprang from a desire to present a united front against the growth of Social Democracy and hold the non-Socialist working men for the Centre, was strongly opposed at Berlin, where the preservation of the exclusively Catholic character of the party and the increased control over it by the Catholic hierarchy were firmly demanded. The quarrel—for it unfortunately became that—led to ecclesiastical intervention and to a final compromise. A complete reconciliation, nevertheless, between the Cologne and Berlin "Richtung" (Tendency) was not effected until the outbreak of war.

In August, 1914, both dualisms were abolished by the all-compelling fact of the alleged "peril of the Fatherland." As far as the first is concerned the democratic section, those who had laid stress on the parliamentary system and opposed excessive militarist activity, became as jingoistic as the rest. The anti-English utterances of Herr Erzberger in the early months of the war have often been quoted. In these, as well as in the fervour of his support to the Government, he, probably the most democratic Centre deputy, equalled the most conservative. As time went on, however, far-seeing men in the party were compelled to note the growing aversion in the country from all Imperialistic aims and the increasing tendency towards democratic institutions. The realisation of these facts during 1917 inspired a moderately favourable attitude by most of the party to the proposals for constitutional reform and a decided opposition to the thorough-going annexationism which had hitherto been advocated by prominent Centre leaders and newspapers, particularly the *Kölnische*

Volkszeitung—the other great Centre paper, *Germania*, published in Berlin, had generally been moderate. In July, 1917, came the famous Reichstag Resolution. As far as the Centre is concerned this marked the triumph of the democratic tendency. The greatness of Herr Erzberger's share in promoting the movement which culminated in it cannot be questioned. His motives are more difficult to determine. The strongest, in all probability, was his clear perception of the fact that the persistence of his party in their jingoistic and anti-democratic activity would throw the Catholic working-class into the arms of Social Democracy as of the only party definitely committed to a reasonable peace and a popular suffrage policy. The championing of these causes, we may imagine Herr Erzberger to have argued, would "dish" the Social Democrats and save the Catholic working-class electorate for the Centre. Even if no more idealistic argument than this were used it was good and sufficient. Erzberger was allowed his way. His clever political strategy succeeded, for the voices of Catholic electors in democratic districts, which had been loud in their murmurs against their representatives, were stilled. The effect abroad of the Resolution, which too we may be quite certain was not left out of Herr Erzberger's calculations, was also a justification of his action.

Had Herr Erzberger not succeeded, we may surmise, the Centre Party would have been in a distinctly unfavourable position at the conclusion of the armistice on November 11th, 1918. Allied with the Conservatives, in fact if not in name, it would have suffered the same fate and have risked handing thousands of its voters over to the Socialists, who alone seemed to have had their policy justified. German Socialist speakers sometimes refer to the Centre as their most dangerous enemy. They are justified, not in spite of the fact that there is a striking similarity between the Socialist demands and those officially put forward by the Centre, not in spite of the fact that there is, particularly in Bavaria, a well-marked tendency on the part of the Centre to co-operate with the Socialists—not in spite of these things, but precisely because of them.

There has been, we might say, a complete change of tactics. The former Centre Party, after 1893, aimed in general at attracting its poorer voters by its Catholic character, its richer supporters by the measures it favoured. The new Centrum, now called the Christian, not Catholic, Democratic People's Party, expects to attract its richer voters by its religious

character, and to hold its poorer supporters by the democratic programme it has definitely adopted. For, except for a few clauses on Germany's right to colonies and economic opportunities—and, after all, Socialist programmes have made similar demands—the programme of the new Centre is avowedly democratic, Christian, pacific and internationalist. The following gives a fair summary of its main points :

In regard to *foreign policy* the Party declares for self-determination of nations, a League of Nations, compulsory arbitration, fair share in colonial activity, international labour legislation.

In *domestic policy* it calls for the maintenance of the German Empire on a federal basis, equal franchise with proportional representation, national governments in the Empire and the individual federal states.

The party in its *economic policy* will support maintenance of individual enterprise, the promotion of agriculture, the advancement of the middle-class, expropriation of landed property with compensation, juster distribution of taxation, part confiscation of war profits.

In *educational policy* the Party will stand for freedom of conscience, free education, defence of parents' rights to educate their children, systematic population-policy. It will further oppose enforced changes in the relation of Church and State as also the spread of demoralising literature and art.

We shall not be far wrong in assuming that, as Herr Erzberger brought the majority of the Centre to the point of supporting the Reichstag Resolution, so he has had the greatest share in drawing up this new policy. It is radical, but a good many of its clauses are but a logical development of tendencies which always have been present in the Centre Party's tradition. Particularly is this the case with the demands for the maintenance of the federal character of the Empire and the encouragement of the peasantry and middle-class, with the opposition to intolerant State Socialism combined with far-reaching claims on industrial capital. Most of the remaining clauses in the programme are adaptations of the *Rerum Novarum* Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. and the equally epoch-making Papal Note of August, 1917. On paper, then, there seem every prospect of the new Centre's exercising a considerable and beneficial influence on that new Germany which, as all hope, will arise as the sins of the old are confessed and reparation done. Whatever the political future of the German people may be, there is no doubt that German Catholics have an important part to play in the moral and political reconstruction

of their Empire—shattered, in the last resort, by its disregard of moral principle. This fact must excite the sympathetic interest of Catholics everywhere. During the war, on certain occasions prior to it, the Centre has seemed deserving of censure ; it has sometimes, during the war nearly always, placed national considerations above all others, the party advantages it hoped to gain above the Christian principles implicit in its constitution. We may hope that the spirit of un-Christian jingoism, of illicit compromise with deceit and tyranny, has now come to a definite end. In any case, all who wish to see the application of Christian principles to public life will do well to follow the history of the new German Centre. Closely bound up with the sincerity of its professions, with its success or failure, is the future welfare of Germany, perhaps also its early re-entry into the comity of European nations.

“QUIVIS.”

TEMPERANCE

WHAT judgment and authority
 Must hold the balance mean,
 Hung on a hair so daintily,
 A difficult point and keen—
 The weight will drop beneath the touch
 Of one small grain of dust too much !
 A perilous adventure this,
 To which our feet are led,
 The line 'yond which our joy and bliss
 Are snared and surfeited—
 Let not a coward soul aspire
 To gain a satisfied desire !
 Yet foolish he who would forego
 The use, for fear abuse
 Should lure him to his overthrow—
 For such an one must lose
 The honour and the hearty zest
 Attendant always on the quest.
 No easy thing he may expect,
 No beaten road and tame,
 Who seeks to save a heaven wrecked
 By hell's infernal flame,
 When virtue armoured *cap-à-pie*
 Rides out with Law and Liberty.

THEODORE MAYNARD.

ANGLI-CANONICAL OBEDIENCE

“**A**T the institution of the Rev. W. H. J. Platts as Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels, North Kensington, on the Fourth Sunday in Advent, the Bishop of London took the opportunity of making a solemn pronouncement on the vexed question of Benediction and Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament, calling upon the clergy of his diocese to loyally obey (*sic*) the regulations he had made in respect of these matters.”

Thus *The Church Times* of January 3rd, which, elsewhere in the same issue, styles the pronouncement, “striking” and “important,” adding that “the obligation of canonical obedience clearly applies” to it, and that “there is only one course for priests who believe in the authority of the Church: it is to obey.”

“The substance of his lordship’s address” is given, and its perusal shows that the “vexed question of Benediction” occupied a secondary place. Its main subject is indicated in the heading given to this paper—to define the kind of obedience which Anglicans who are “loyal to their bishop” are expected to yield to his directions. The occasion was appropriate for some such definition: for Prebendary Denison, the late Vicar of St. Michael’s, had recently published “an open letter”¹ addressed to his lordship, in the course of which he dealt in a trenchant manner with “the amazing theory” that the Canon which demands obedience “is the Canon of the chief minister of the diocese”: “is it conceivable,” he asks, “that any sane man would take an oath of Canonical Obedience if this ridiculous theory were supposed to underlie the word ‘canonical’”? He points out that “such a pitiful absurdity as this would, of course, create as many religions as there are dioceses”: and adds that “this comic opera kind of Canon would rob the faithful in each diocese of any security as to continuity in their religion”—which, in fact, is exactly what it does.

Dr. Ingram, however, sees nothing unreasonable in the position: on the contrary, he re-asserts it in the plainest terms: “It is said that in some dioceses uncanonical commands are

¹ Canonical Obedience: An Open Letter to the Lord Bishop of London, addressed to his Lordship by Henry Phipps Denison. Robert Scott, 6d. net.

given. This may be so or not, but it has nothing whatever to do with us. Our good brother here has taken the oath of canonical obedience to me, and not to some other bishop." But who is to be the judge as to whether a command is, or is not, uncanonical? If "our good brother" were transferred to the diocese of Manchester he might be bound by obedience to Bishop Knox's command to abandon the use of the eucharistic vestments which find favour in the eyes of the Bishop of London—and if not, why not?

Although it would almost seem, from Dr. Ingram's "sic volo, sic jubeo" attitude, that he regards obedience as due to him personally, it may be supposed that he would concede that his predecessors in the See were equally entitled to it. But if the commands of Bishop Blomfield in the early fifties had been obeyed, or those of Bishops Jackson and Tait with regard to St. Alban's, Holborn, had been complied with, what would have become of the Anglican movement, to which Dr. Ingram, so far as it pleases him, gives his support? How far would functions such as these which his lordship from time to time honours with his presence at All Saints, Margaret Street, have been possible, and where would be his cope and mitre? It is not too much to say that every step in the Catholic direction has been opposed by the bishops: "it is a matter of common knowledge," says the writer of a remarkable pamphlet entitled *The Tombs of the Prophets*,¹—wherein is set forth, with much particularity, the steady and continued efforts of the Anglican Hierarchy to suppress the Catholic party in the Establishment—"that the movement has succeeded in the teeth of bitter and persistent opposition from the bishops."

Apart, however, from the practical argument thus presented, the fact that Dr. Ingram himself has no settled policy of action, must tend to weaken his claim to obedience; it is not easy to yield implicit compliance to directions given to-day, when you know by experience that the giver may, in a short space of time, himself act in direct opposition to the rules he has laid down. It would be easy to adduce instances in which Dr. Ingram has modified his policy in accordance with pressure, or even as a reward for compliance with his wishes—e.g., as when, at the jubilee of All Saints, Margaret Street, he allowed the use of incense, which he had previously forbidden. The remarkable change of attitude manifested by his lordship with regard to the question of reservation goes far

¹ Published by the Society of St. Peter and St. Paul, 1s. net.

to justify the view—maintained by some of his clergy—that he may, in time, authorise Benediction and Exposition, to which, indeed, according to *The Church Times*, he “made it plain that he himself has no rooted objection.” It may be worth while to contrast the position now publicly approved by Dr. Ingram with that adopted by him thirteen years ago, due attention being given to the fact that no reason has been alleged for his lordship’s change of opinion.

At St. Michael’s, Dr. Ingram, having laid down that :—

“Nothing is more important or more vital to believers in the Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament than our own conduct towards it, and [that] the bishop of the diocese has, by age-long custom, been the guardian in the diocese of that precious treasure,”

continues :—

“There are certain rules that are issued by him in this diocese which preclude the service of Benediction and Exposition, *while allowing access to and prayers in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament*, so long as those prayers are approved by him. All authorities agree as to his being the proper authority, and that these commands issued by him are legitimate ones and must be obeyed, and the oath of canonical obedience is a promise to render obedience in this.”

Later on, having stated the objection that “there is very little difference between prayers being said and hymns being sung when the tabernacle is closed or open,” he replies : “There is this one great difference : *one is allowed* and the other is forbidden.”

The importance of the words which I have italicised will be seen when they are compared with the attitude adopted by Dr. Ingram and enforced on his clergy thirteen years ago, as set forth in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1905. At that period—I epitomise his lordship’s answers, but refer to their numbers in the authorised Report—he did not “feel justified in sanctioning [reservation], but only in tolerating what [he] found existing under certain conditions” (21034); he “did not want the custom to spread at all” (21033); and such toleration as was given was on the undertaking that it was solely for the purpose of communicating the sick. He emphasises “the clear difference between reservation for the sick and reservation for purposes of adoration” and states that he has always been “very strong against any use of the reservation of the Sacra-

ment for visits to the Blessed Sacrament as part of the devotional life of the people or for purposes of adoration" (20738)—it is interesting to note that at least one church in his lordship's diocese now frequently advertises "Adoration" as a feature of the Sunday evening service. "It is not true," says his lordship, who was somewhat severely heckled by the Commissioners, that reservation has been "sanctioned in any way at all"; it has, however, been "tolerated—that is to say, the church should be visited if the reserved Sacrament was kept in a locked chapel into which no one at all might enter except the priest who took the Sacrament to the sick person" (20739). "Visited," it should be explained, means that at that period Dr. Ingram refused to visit churches which did not comply with his then ruling regarding reservation and incense. "Any case of the reserved Sacrament which admits of devotions to the reserved Sacraments or visits to it, as part of the devotional life" was, at that period, "outside the toleration" (20741); and, in answer to a question, his lordship stated that the "locked chapel" was to be closed with "something like locked doors through which it was impossible for the reserved Sacrament to be seen"; the suggestion that it might be possible for people "to see through the gates to where a tabernacle or pyx was" was repudiated by his lordship as "quibbling with the arrangement: it is not in any way sanctioned: it is not tolerated" (20741-2).

The temptation to quote further from the Bishop of London's evidence must be resisted; those who are not acquainted with the Report can have little notion of the amusement to be derived from his lordship's examination as reported in its columns. Those enterprising "publishers to the Church of England," the Society of SS. Peter and Paul, would find in it ample material for one of their trenchant pamphlets—in view of present developments "Compromise and its Failure" would be no inapt title. Sufficient, however, has been adduced to show that his lordship's own attitude has completely changed, and that what in 1905 was at most "tolerated" in exceptional cases, is now by the same authority "generally allowed" and approved.

It may be of interest to add a brief summary of the present position of reservation in the diocese of London. The "locked gates," or closed doors, which were *de rigueur* in 1905 have long since disappeared; the tabernacle on the high altar or in a side chapel conforms exactly to the ordinary Catholic model,

with a white veil in front of it and a lamp above. Nor is this only in churches of "ultramarine" tinge: Christ Church, Westminster, presents nothing that is "extreme" or beyond what is moderately high; yet there the Rev. R. J. Campbell has erected a side altar, on which the elements are reserved in the way above mentioned. The understanding that the Sacrament was reserved only for the sick, if this was ever more than a one-sided agreement, has in like manner, at any rate in some churches, been set aside. I remember reading in the *All Saints' Margaret Street Magazine*, a paper in which the Vicar said that, looking from his window at an early hour, he saw a soldier coming from the church, and was comforted by the thought that, owing to reservation, the man had been able to receive Holy Communion before starting for the front. Whether in "ultramarine" churches reservation is practised only in one kind I do not know, but I believe such to be the case: a writer in the *Guardian* some time back, in the course of a correspondence relating to one of these churches, asked the Vicar whether he gave Communion only in one kind, and the question, although repeated, was never answered. The monstrances employed, so far as I have seen them, correspond with our own, and, indeed, are largely supplied by Catholic firms, although the catalogue of the Society of SS. Peter and Paul figures one "specially designed for SS.P.P.," and another in ordinary Roman style. It may be remembered that in the earlier days of the Movement a special monstrance was prepared in order that both kinds might be present, the wine being in a glass tube which encircled the host; but this never came into general use.

So far as the Bishop of London's address related to Benediction and Reservation, its *raison d'être* may be traced to events of last year. A conference¹ was held at St. Saviour's, Hoxton, at which it was decided to push forward the use of Benediction; his lordship then called a meeting of the clergy who practised reservation, and expressed his views on the subject—not, it is rumoured, without arousing a certain amount of protest. The practical outcome of this was the institution of the Forty Hours' Prayer in forty-five churches of the London diocese, during which "continuous intercession before the Most Holy Sacrament" was offered on behalf of the Allies: the period extended from the 1st of October until the 17th of December. No accounts of the services have, so far as I am aware, appeared in the press; the *Church Times*, which in the early days

¹ For an account of the proceedings thereat see *The Month*, August, 1918 p. 141.

of the Movement delighted in accounts of ritualistic services, observes a stony silence where the "ultramarines" are concerned; even the church which was at one time allowed to announce "Rosary, Sermon and Benediction" as its Sunday evening service is now restricted to "6.30 as usual." It is, however, understood that the observances varied from prayer before the tabernacle, two candles being kept burning, to the full performance of the Roman rite with all its accessories: the account published by the Rector of St. John's, Isle of Dogs, in his parish magazine, points to such a function, and, indeed, shows how fully the spirit of the devotion was realised:—

No one who took part in the Forty Hours' Prayer could fail to be impressed with the solemnity of the time, and one cannot be thankful enough for having had such a privilege. It was not the services, beautiful though they were, or the splendid congregations, or the steady stream of reverent watchers, or even the crowded altar rail; it was just, I think, the wonderful eloquent silence. I feel sure many of us have learnt more about prayer during these two days and nights than ever we knew before.

It may be noted in conclusion that the columns of the *Church Times* already show that the Bishop's "solemn pronouncement" is not to pass unchallenged: thus his statement that in matters other than Exposition and Benediction "precisely the same obedience is enforced in his diocese" is met with "a direct denial" from a well-known "ultramarine" layman, who has "challenged the Bishop, both publicly and privately, on this very point," and is prepared to give "names, dates and details." His lordship's quotation from St. Paul, "Shall I come to you with a rod?" suggests that he is prepared to do something terrible to those who are not "loyal" to what he, for the time being, chooses to command; but how is he going to enforce his admonitions? Dr. Ingram in his address cited as an excuse "sometimes made" by those who resist his ruling that

the obedience admittedly given to a bishop in the Roman Catholic Church need not be given to a bishop in the Catholic branch of the Church of England.

It is difficult to believe that anyone ever said anything so absurd, involving, as it does, a new "branch theory";¹ but the

¹ His lordship however, is apt to be imaginative when he attempts to represent the views of those who differ from him: thus at St. Alban's Holborn, last June, he is reported (*Church Times*, June 28th) as having said that "when he heard of people leaving Church of England for Rome for the sake of Benediction, he felt that their consciences were somewhat flabby." Has anyone ever "heard" of a conversion on this ground?

statement in itself is, in the main, true. A Catholic priest would never dream of withholding canonical obedience from his Bishop; he knows that the Bishop himself is bound by rules, —should he appear to infringe them there is a right of appeal to a higher power whose claim to obedience both Bishop and appellant recognise. But a State-made Bishop can only appeal for the enforcement of his decrees to the secular power which created him, whose servant he is; and the recalcitrants are not likely to be intimidated by a threat which can only be carried out through the secular courts. Meanwhile they will wait patiently until Dr. Ingram, who has already himself set aside his injunctions of 1905, has seen his way to "tolerate" if not to "sanction," practices to which "he himself has no rooted objection."

It is instructive to see the contradictions into which those Anglicans are led who wish to uphold "canonical" obedience without recognising the source of the ruler's right to it. In an endeavour as long ago as October 14th, 1910, to explain the theory of episcopal authority in the Church of England *The Church Times* wrote as follows :—

To be a disciple is not to submit one's conscience in docile fashion to the control of a guide who teaches what one believes, who orders what one desires to do, who pleases one's fancy or *approves himself to one's judgment* (italics ours) : it is to recognise the fact, independent of one's desires, that here is a man commissioned from on high to direct souls in the way of Christ.

This is certainly the Catholic view of the episcopate, but *The Church Times* cannot manage to maintain it even to the end of its article, for, later, answering the objection that the Bishop may be wrong, it writes :—

How shall it be known when a Bishop is thus falsifying his authority? We come here, as we must always come, to the individual Christian conscience. A Christian who knows or *thinks he knows* (italics ours), his Bishop and Pastor to be so erring owes him no obedience. He owes him rather defiance.

So in the Anglican system "we come, as we must always come," to private judgment! The Anglican subjected to an heretical Bishop, has no fixed standard by which to prove him heretical and no means whereby to have him corrected because he knows no infallible teaching authority. Without this each individual is his own Pope and obeys his Bishop only when he approves of his ruling.

JAMES BRITTEN.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE "MODERN MIND" AT WORK.

IT would seem that, just as the Spartans used their drunken Helots to point a salutary moral, the Editor of the *Hibbert Journal* in his January issue has provided for the student of human perversity an exhibition of the effects of "Modernism" on those who habitually take it undiluted. For men whose duty it is thus to "scan error for the confirmation of truth," this exhibition is a most depressing sight, quite as depressing as the perusal of the R.P.A. Annual or any similar rationalistic production. And for much the same reason. It is a sad sight to behold *soi-disant* Christians abandoning their glorious heritage of revelation, closing their minds to the Light which enlighteneth every human being that cometh into the World, and with the faint rush-light of their fallible reason thinking to fathom the abyss of divinity, and fully to explain the incomprehensible judgments and unsearchable ways of God. The one note of all these essays, showing itself both in their style and their substance, is intellectual self-sufficiency, the refusal to acknowledge insoluble mystery, to admit unpalatable truth, to follow any save self-chosen guides; showing itself, too, in unfairness towards adversaries and a mental arrogance which implies that theirs is the last word in wisdom and their mind the measure of all truth. The usual rhetorical tricks of the partizan are also much in evidence, the question-begging *clichés*—"all impartial students will grant," "no serious critic disputes," "the most Christian Churches agree," "modern criticism has established,"—the bold ignoring or ignorance of all inconvenient facts, the substitution of repeated assertions for proof; in a word, what we may aptly call Prussianism in controversy, for its arrogance mainly derived from German rationalism.¹ It appears, indeed, that, although the Allies have utterly beaten the Teuton in the field, that conquered foe still maintains his supremacy over the non-Catholic mentality of this country. All these rationalising prelates and professors are but the followers of Luther, the apostle of private judgment, and of those lineal descendants of his, the German rationalists who have laboured to turn Christianity into mythology and to ridicule revelation. In so far as this poisonous influence persists and

¹ The destructive work of the German, in the field of religion as in the field of war, is more in evidence than the constructive, but this should not blind us to the splendid work which orthodox German theologians, philosophers, historians and scientists have done for the cause of truth. The non-Catholic world wilfully shuts its eyes to their labours but we Catholics have gratefully to acknowledge them at every turn.

spreads, the Prussian will be avenged; as ancient Greece was avenged by the corruption with which she infected her conqueror, Rome.

And all this work of destruction, this "sapping a solemn creed," if not "with solemn sneer," at any rate with solemn parade of zeal for truth, is going on at a time when the full faith in Christ, the Divine Redeemer, the Saviour of the individual and of society, is necessary to restore and preserve that shattered civilization which Christianity created. And the Church of which these men are ordained officials, the Church of England, is actually appealing at the moment to all and sundry for a sum of five million pounds to enable it to do, what it never has done and never can do, viz.: present Christianity to the nation in a true, definite, authoritative and consistent form. The Church of England is not a teaching Church: it has no means of distinguishing truth from error: all sorts of contradictions are preached from her pulpits, are expressed in her literature, appear in her councils and her episcopal charges. She is rotten with rationalism which she cannot get rid of. "Modernism," long since ejected from the Church of Christ, flourishes unrebuked in her very heart, and justifies, at every step of its downward progress, its condemnation by Christ's Vicar as the compendium of all heresies. Christians in her communion, believers in Christ's divinity, if not in the divinity of His mystical body, may denounce and repudiate these heretics, but they have no remedy, no means of dissociating themselves from their communion. Zanzibar may excommunicate Hereford, but the world only laughs, and Christian Anglicans are helpless. Their Church, as a Church, doesn't know the truth and cannot authoritatively determine it. They can only quit the company of heresy by becoming Catholics.

We may now glance at a few of the manifestations of this plague as they appear in the current *Hibbert*, for they usefully exemplify all the vices of the "modern mind," an entity dealt with some months ago in this Review.¹

The Lord Bishop of Carlisle, inspired by the project of a League of Nations, considers it scandalous that a League of Churches has not long ago set the example. As he considers, following his master, Harnack, that Christ founded no Church and that therefore all existing Churches are man-made, each embodying its peculiar excellence and being rightfully autonomous, his discontent with the present chaos is intelligible. Not so intelligible is his contention, in support of which he presents a grotesque travesty of early Church history, that the Papacy has been the prolific source of schism and dissension, unless in the sense that authority is the cause of rebellion and law the source of sin. As a matter of fact, apart from the Greek schism, a political catastrophe, the Papacy kept Christendom substantially united in belief and practice for sixteen hundred years. Of course, if all the Churches are man-made and there is no sacramental system and no means

¹ See "The Modern Mind." *THE MONTH*, April, 1918.

of grace or propitiation, unity is only possible through free federation, but the Bishop makes no attempt to prove his far-reaching assumption. All through his essay he takes for granted, like all his brother modernists, that because historical science is of late growth, therefore the ancients, even those inspired by God, could not accurately grasp or transmit truth; that, because in certain branches of human knowledge, the physical sciences chiefly, later discoveries have revolutionized old tenets, therefore divine revelation must suffer the like fate; that, because the human mind cannot wholly comprehend the Infinite, therefore it cannot arrive at any certainty about it, and that, because God accepts all men of good faith and good will, therefore he cannot have laid down certain fixed conditions and prescribed certain normal methods of salvation. The modern mind displayed by the Bishop seems incapable of taking a balanced view of the facts, even in the natural order, whilst of course it ignores altogether Christ's promise of divine assistance to the rulers of the Church, through the Holy Spirit teaching them all truth.

The next modernist essay takes the form of a criticism, by Canon Wilson, of Worcester, of the *Report of the Archbishops' First Committee of Enquiry on the Teaching Office of the Church*, in which he pleads for a progressive theology. His only concern is with his own communion, and we are grateful that he does not venture to prescribe, as so many of his school do, for the needs of other bodies outside his experience. Contemplating Anglicanism, he says—"The shelves of our Cathedral libraries groan with the weight of extinct theologies," which may very well be the case, for Anglican philosophy and theology have no firm roots in the past and lie mainly outside the Catholic tradition. Thus they change with the mental fashion of the day, whilst Catholic theology presents an orderly development, stable and self-consistent. But Anglican theology does not move fast enough for the modern mind of the Canon, and the result is that at present it is keeping out of Christianity a large number of earnest scientific men, whose reasons tell them that the Contingent necessarily implies the Absolute, and the Finite the Infinite, yet do not tell them exactly how the Absolute and the Infinite can possess personality. If then our (Anglican) theology would only depersonalise and deanthropomorphise (the coinage is the Canon's) the conception of God, why, even the Rationalist Press Association might enrol themselves in the ranks of our truly national and comprehensive Church. For the Canon's plea issues in pure Naturalism. He brings us back to the old *cliché* of Arnold—"The enduring Power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness." Instead of our personal God, our Loving Father, the Canon would have us "realize the ever-presence and urge of a Vital Power, a Life Force, immense, eternal, manifesting itself in all creation and supremely in man." Only with this, having put away childish notions of fatherhood and sonship, will the modern mind be content, and if incidentally the doctrines of

the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Atonement (which have no meaning if there is no divine Personality), the duties of worship and service, the need of churches and of—Canons, are also put away, Canon Wilson in his tenderness for that stern lover of truth, the scientific man with the modern mind, will no doubt cheerfully make the sacrifice.

The Rev. J. M. Thompson is perhaps the most prominent of the Anglican modernists, but so far he has not gone to the lengths achieved by Canon Wilson. He remains a theist, though he has long given up belief in the divinity of our Lord. But we are not sure that the new position to which he advances in his speculations on "Christian Faith" will not more repel the Christian than the wordy agnosticism of his fellow-Anglican. Not content with making Christ a mere fallible man and rending the Gospels into shreds in the effort to free them from the miraculous, he now ventures on the monstrous insinuation that our Lord was not sinless. The "moral miracle" of absolute sinlessness is more than his modern mind can accept. It is, forsooth, not proven: we have no historical evidence to support it: it is just as foreign to our experience as the nature-miracles which the modernist has already rejected. We need not linger over this melancholy exhibition of modernism run wild. The whole position of the Thompson School has been thoroughly exposed and exploded in these pages more than once.¹ But we may note how absurdly and characteristically the essayist exaggerates the claims of historical science when he says, "The present generation is in a better position to judge (the Gospels as historical narratives) than any before it, since they were first written down," including, therefore, the Apostolic age itself. He forgets that Christianity had to make its way in face of the fiercest hostility, that it was exposed to the attacks of keen and bitter intellects, both Jewish and Gentile, ready and able and willing to expose and denounce any false assertion or logical flaw in its presentment, that the Church was not founded on the late and imperfect Gospel record, but on the living witness and faith of the Apostles. What liberties this champion of historical science is ready to take with his material may be seen by a brief extract. "What chiefly sustained the Apostles' faith (he asks) between Calvary and Pentecost? Not the evidence of the Resurrection," and then he adds, presumably as grounds for his statement, "which they did not preach till forty days later." But they did not preach anything till forty days later, and how does Mr. Thompson know what they thought in the meantime? "Not (he goes on) the memory of our Lord's life and experience," and again he gives his reason "which they did not record for twenty years." Had, they, then, forgotten it in the meantime, or rather were they not incessantly preaching it from the first? The critic is dumb, but finds it convenient to ignore this latter fact, in order to give plausibility to

¹ See articles by Father S. Smith: "The Gospel of the Non-Miraculous" July, 1913, "The Gospel without the Resurrection," April, 1914, "Anti-Miraculous Presuppositions," July, 1915, etc., etc.

his own theory that the Apostles' faith was based "on the ineradicable hope that, although rejected as an impostor and put to death as a criminal, He (Christ) would shortly return as the Messiah." So according to this modern mind, so lamentably blinded by its own conceit, the virtue of faith can be based topsy-turvywise on hope, and the Apostles' wish was father to their thought!

We need not follow Mr. Thompson, as he follows his German masters, into his exposition of the arbitrary distinction between the historical and the mystical, between Jesus and the Christ, so dear to the modernist; if for no other reason, because that distinction, according to St. John (1 Ep. iv. 3) who knew more about the matter than does the modern mind, "is not of God." The next article, by an American Professor, asks with unintended irony, "Again, what is Christianity?" He may well ask, after his modernist friends have done with it! St. Paul, poor man, thought that he had answered the question definitely enough, but Professor Pratt, of Williams College, Mass., comes, an angel as it were from heaven (Ephes. 1. 8), to put us finally wise on the matter. The central dogma of the Professor's "other gospel," which has little dogmatic besides, is that our Lord was a good, but often mistaken, man, and that Christianity received its chief inspiration from Him, though St. John and St. Paul and others had much to do with its formation. But its doctrines, such of them as the modern mind can accept, gain their validity, not from His authority, but from their own intrinsic merit. So, as we may reasonably conclude, Christianity may step down from the supernatural plane and take its place amongst the natural religions.

As if to show that there is *no* outworn fallacy or exploded prophecy which these modernists do not try to resurrect, another essayist, the Rev. R. Rhynd, Reader of the Temple, professes to regard the Papacy, the spiritual power and influence of which was never stronger or more widespread than to-day, as dead or at least moribund, destined to go the way of Rabbinism. His main contribution to this feast of unreason may be embodied in his own statement—"What men think of Jesus matters little, or rather, *how* they think of Him matters much: it is the only thing that *does* matter." In such cryptic fashion does the modern mind break the bread of the Gospel to a famishing world.

There is more of the sort in the current *Hibbert*, but our readers have probably had a surfeit. We have noticed these things here partly as a further indication of the incompetence of the Anglican Church to guard or teach the truth, for most of these rationalists hold benefices of hers, partly to show what becomes of the Scriptures when taken from the protection of the Catholic Church which produced them, and exposed to the "frightfulness" of the German Professor, and what becomes of the faith when St. Paul's process is reversed, and it is brought into subjection to the "modern" mind. "Whatever the human intellect has gained by the growth of knowledge and skill—and the gain has been immense—the

Church of all the ages has assimilated and utilised in the exposition of her doctrine. She has never denied the rights of reason, but upheld and defended them. And she has been equally careful in upholding the rights of God.

J. K.

THE CLAIRVOYANCE OF BISHOP LEADBEATER.

IT were much to be desired that the various denominations of Theosophists would come to some agreement among themselves with regard to their nomenclature. We had begun by heading this note "Theosophical Clairvoyance," but then it occurred to us that there are many who call themselves Theosophists who are just as little disposed to accept the claims of Mrs. Besant and Mr. Leadbeater to pierce the veils of sense and look into the occult as we are ourselves. It would, therefore, be hardly fair to lay at the door of all promiscuously what is the more or less distinctive extravagance of the Adyar contingent. We have on one or two previous occasions given some slight illustrations of the lengths to which Mr. Leadbeater was prepared to go in bamboozling the dupes who look up to him as a mystical adept of the first water. From the moral point of view it must be plain that a man with his record is not likely to stick at any form of deception. As we previously noted, *John Bull* has twice over said of him that Leadbeater was a "teacher of filth . . . who instead of being permitted to work with decent men and women, should be tied to a cart-tail and flogged from Temple Bar to Aldgate Pump." *John Bull* was perfectly specific in its accusations, but Mr. Leadbeater found it convenient to take the castigation lying down and to pursue his occult researches in the safe remoteness of India or Australasia. Some short time ago he printed here in England a brochure entitled *An Occult View of the War*, and it is from this that we propose to make an extract to illustrate the audacity with which this self-styled clairvoyant trades upon the gullibility of his fellow Theosophists. Speaking of the late Prince Bismarck, Mr. Leadbeater informs us that on Madame Blavatsky's showing the famous Chancellor "had considerable occult knowledge, and that before the war with France in 1870 he had travelled physically to certain points to the north, south, east and west of France, and had there cast certain spells of some sort, or made magnetic centres, with the object of preventing effective resistance to the German armies." But after this preliminary Mr. Leadbeater goes on in his own person:—

In the course of the work of the invisible helpers on the battlefield I have several times encountered and spoken to the Prince, who naturally

watches with the keenest interest all that happens ; and some months ago I had an interesting conversation with him. Speaking of the war, he said that if we were servants of the Hierarchy and students of Occultism we must know that Germany was in the right. One of our party, becoming somewhat indignant, replied that all the rest of the world was willing to be at peace, that Germany had made an unprovoked attack and had caused all this awful carnage and was therefore entirely in the wrong. But the Prince said : " No, no ; you do not understand. This is a struggle which had to come. . . . Which is nearer to the true ideal of a King—our Kaiser who holds his power from God alone, or your King George who can strike out no line of his own ? And the French President, what is he but the scum momentarily thrown to the top of a boiling mass of corruption ? " ¹

Now it does not add to our confidence in the value of these clairvoyant communications with Prince Bismarck in the other world to find from another page of the same brochure that Mr. Leadbeater puts unhesitating trust in certain figures regarding the prevalence of crime in Germany published by Mr. F. W. Wile in *Pearson's Magazine* and by Dr. T. F. Smith in his book *The Soul of Germany*. With these bogus statistics we dealt exhaustively in our number for January, 1916,² and we showed that the said Dr. T. F. Smith, either idiotically deluded or utterly unscrupulous, has, in comparing English and German crime, left out of account in the former case all offences except indictable offences in which the prisoner was formally committed for trial. By this simple arrangement we obtain such startling results as that quoted by Mr. Leadbeater in the brochure before us :

The professor [Dr. Smith was not in fact a " professor "] takes first the crime of maliciously or feloniously wounding—of this there occurred in England 1,262 cases, so we might expect in Germany about 2,200 ; the actual number is 172,153.³

As was pointed out in the article referred to, the true number of charges of the same nature dealt with in English courts was not 1,262 but 47,878, so that the proportion of such crimes of violence in the two countries was not 68 to 1, but about 2 to 1. Now what, we ask, can be the value of Mr. Leadbeater's clairvoyant conversations with Prince Bismarck, when all his mystical intuitions into countries far distant and ages far remote do not enable him to correct a glaring blunder of fact which is right under his nose and which might have been rectified by a few minutes spent over the examination of one of our parliamentary Blue Books ?

But Mrs. Besant herself is just as ridiculous. Witness this

¹ C. W. Leadbeater, *An Occult View of the War*, pp. 16—17.

² " Truth and Falsehood about crime in Germany," pp. 19—33.

³ *An Occult View of the War*, p. 12.

quotation from certain utterances of hers on the subject of Transubstantiation.

Now if a clairvoyant watches what is done when a sacrament is taking place (*sic*) he sees that on the repetition of the words of consecration and the making of the sign of power, a visible change occurs in the consecrated object. It is most marked if we turn to the Holy Eucharist. You have there on the altar the sacred elements, the bread and the wine. According to Catholic doctrine, at the words of power (the *mantra*) what is called transubstantiation takes place. . . . In the invisible worlds these things can be seen, so that the piece of opaque bread, when the words are spoken, utterly changes its appearance, becoming luminous and shining out in every direction. At the moment one sees that, one begins to realize what a sacrament means from the material standpoint.¹

It is needless to quote more at length. That Mrs. Annie Besant, the associate of Charles Bradlaugh, should devote herself in her old age to churning out superstitious drivel of this sort is one of the ironies of history.

H. T.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The General Election.

The Election which closed the year 1918 presents several points of interest to the student of political systems, upon which one may lawfully touch in these non-political pages. It was something of a satire on democracy. The sovereign people have become even less free than Rousseau described them, for the use of their sovereignty is now limited to a single day. Yet even so only about half the electorate voted, some abstaining because no choice of candidates was offered them, some, like many soldiers abroad, because they had not sufficient opportunity, some from mere apathy. The Government made its appeal to the country in order, as it said, to enter the peace negotiations supported by the free choice of the electorate, but it did all it could by the aid of party machinery to minimize that freedom of choice. As a result it was returned by a colossal majority, its supporters being reckoned as 485 out of a house of 707. The natural deduction would be that the country was solidly behind the Government and had given it the blank cheque it desired. But papers of every shade have analyzed the votes cast, with surprising results. The votes cast for the Government in the United Kingdom turn out to be practically equal to those cast for the independent parties! Thus since only half the electorate voted, the Government's

¹ *Occultism of the Mass and the Old Catholic Movement*, pp 51—52; from the *Changing World*, p. 269.

enormous majority rests upon about a fourth of the whole voting power of the State! There were, of course, uncontested elections, the majority of which were in favour of the Government, but they were not numerous enough to invalidate the above conclusion. This curious result illustrates nothing new in the British Constitution. It has always been recognised as theoretically possible that one-half of the electorate should gain all the seats in the House for one party, by a majority corresponding to the number of members, since each particular contest might be decided by a single vote. The present system does not and cannot guarantee that any party will be represented in the House in proportion to its strength in the country. And that, we take it, is its condemnation from the democratic point of view, and its danger to public stability. It has been computed by a *Times* correspondent that under a system of proportional representation, such as the "vested interests" of Parliament rejected a year ago, the Government majority would have been only 113, the Independent Liberals would have had 57 seats instead of 18, "Labour" 133 instead of 63, whilst in Ireland, taking contested elections only, the Republicans would have had 37 instead of 47, the Nationalists 17 instead of 6, and the Unionists 22 instead of 23. Consequently, a large proportion of the electorate has no direct representation, no constitutional means of expressing its will and venting its grievances. We cannot wonder, then, that amongst the unrepresented there are already suggestions of "direct action."

**The Peace
Conference, the
Press, and the
Pope.**

The Peace Conference in Paris which means so much for the future of humanity was formally opened by the French President on Saturday, January 18th. The world was astonished at the attempt made by the plenipotentiaries to enforce the old bad diplomatic tradition of secrecy, an ill-omened beginning which showed how far some at least of them were from understanding the new order of things created by the war of the nations. The nations who have toiled and suffered and won the victory are in no mind to leave the peace settlement to a few delegates behind closed doors. The press voiced their determination and the Conference gave way. All formal negotiations and discussions were to be open to the press, and there is no official censoring of their reports. And of course no decisions are to be taken or agreements made without the knowledge of those concerned. At the same time, such is the general character of the press, the primary object of which is not to make peace but to make money, not to provide truth but to provide sensation, and so numerous the "indiscretions" that had already been committed in France and elsewhere, that one can readily understand the desire of the Con-

ference to muzzle this dangerous source of confusion and disunion. They had, in fact, to choose between two evils, that of secret diplomacy conducted by experts and that of newspaper discussion conducted by irresponsible amateurs. We believe they did wisely to reconsider their original mistaken choice. Feeble as is, in many cases, the barrier of editorial discretion against the desire to make money or to make mischief, it is better to risk the possible ill-results of premature or ill-informed publicity than to present the world, sick of war and the sources of war—imperialism, commercial greed, the oppression of nationalities—with even the semblance of another Congress of Vienna. The Holy Alliance were thoroughly Christian in their professions: the crowd of “mixed religionists” in Paris to-day would hardly venture to assert “their fixed resolution . . . to take for their sole guide the precepts of the holy religion of our Saviour; namely, the precepts of justice, Christian charity and peace”; but the kings thought little of justice, charity and peace in comparison with their personal ambitions. And many dangers may be cheerfully risked if only to avoid a repetition of the terrible blunder of those secret Treaties, the memory of which still hangs like a cloud over the Entente and which have had hitherto a more positively evil effect in excluding the Holy Father, incomparably the greatest moral force in the world, from the Conference. Happily, if we may believe the official explanation of the XVth Article, its effect is only to place the Holy See on the same footing as other neutrals, so we may still hope that the deliberating Powers will have the common sense to associate the Church with them in their endeavours to secure a lasting peace.

**The Roman
Question.**

It is clear that the position itself of the Head of the Church must enter into any peace-settlement which is to be permanent. No one has more to gain by the removal of the present anomalies than the Italian Government itself, which for generations has lain on their account under the disfavour of the Catholic world. A just arrangement with the Papacy would do much to establish Italian unity and to promote Italian prestige. Still, what the Holy See would consider just must be left for itself to determine, having in view its functions in the world and the essential needs of the Church. The whole Catholic body in every land is intimately concerned with the fortunes of its Head and would welcome with immense joy the effective recognition of his independence. Pending authoritative news from Rome one can only begin to build hopes upon the news which *The Times* correspondent sent from the Holy City on January 20th, viz., that a new political party had been formed, with the approval but not under the control of the

Vatican, which will make the way clear for Italian Catholics for the first time to enter fully into the Parliamentary life of their country. *The Times* correspondent is good enough to say that the programme of the new body is so "entirely modern" as to be fitly styled "advanced," the only "reactionary" item being its "clerical" opposition to divorce. It seems impossible for these journalists to discard their *clichés*, or to recognize that no civilization, worthy of the name, can be founded except on the stability of the family, which divorce directly attacks. But the main fact of his announcement can hardly be an invention of the Press, and its fuller confirmation will be awaited with the keenest interest. A settlement of the Roman Question, equitable, conciliatory, and guaranteed by international law, would alone immortalize the Peace Conference.

**Social Apathy
amongst
Catholics.**

We have noted that *The Times* correspondent, following a fashion of secular journalism, uses the words "clerical" and "reactionary," as if they were synonyms. That, we know, is a cowardly libel invented by godless continental revolutionists whose exploits abroad used always to be sure of support in the British Press, but whom the British Government by means of the Undesirable Aliens Act kept as far as possible from these shores. Still, although the principles of real civilization and progress are essential parts of Catholic teaching, it has not, unfortunately, followed that Catholics have been keen to learn them and put them in practice. Why is it that Socialism has been allowed to grow so strong in various countries that when a change of Government is affected, the Socialist element assumes power almost as a matter of course? Socialism has not been fostered by merely imaginary grievances: why have not the Catholics of Germany and Austria shown that the practice of Christianity is the solution of all real wrongs? Why have not Catholic ecclesiastics incessantly denounced social injustice and Catholic employers been so conspicuously just in their treatment of their employees that the truth of Catholic social principles has been put beyond cavil or dispute? Much has been done, especially in Belgium, to counter Socialism by real social reform, but our point is that not enough has been done. Multitudes of Catholics here and abroad have never realized that social reform is needed, that the general condition of the working-class almost everywhere is un-Christian, that they themselves by acquiescing in these iniquitous conditions are sharing in the guilt of them, that they are not using the talent of their Faith which shows them so clearly the danger and the sin of mammon-worship. Everywhere, in France, Germany, Belgium, England, practical Catholics have formed organizations for the

study of social problems and the cure of social evils—how miserably have these associations, especially in these islands, been supported. Yet the last three Popes have again and again insisted on the duty of doing so, a duty which a true conception of citizenship as well as of Christianity enforces. And the words of our supreme Pastors have been constantly repeated and emphasised by our Bishops and spiritual guides so that the excuse of ignorance can no longer be advanced. A splendid lead was given to British Catholics by Cardinal Bourne's Lenten Pastoral of last year, wherein his Eminence with a frankness and clearness of statement unsurpassed by Pope Leo himself, declared and denounced the evils of our modern industrial system, endorsed the demands of the labouring-classes, and called upon Catholics to seize the opportunity of these days of reconstruction to proclaim and apply the remedies taught by their faith. It is hardly too much to say that that stirring and eloquent appeal, which should have been echoed and re-echoed from every pulpit, and been made a text-book in every Catholic school in the land, fell upon deaf ears, so that a prominent writer the other day could allude to it as "the Cardinal's forgotten Pastoral."

**Support for the
Catholic Social
Guild.**

It is not perhaps so bad as that. In these momentous days men's minds are distracted by a multitude of interests, so that even the one thing necessary runs a chance of being neglected. But the one thing necessary in social reform is the re-establishment of social justice and the suppression of all those forms of iniquitous dealing to which use and tradition have made us so callous. It is a sad reflection on Catholic zeal in this matter that the one organization amongst them specifically instituted to expound and apply the principles of justice to industrial life should meet with so little support. For ten years the Catholic Social Guild has laboured incessantly with very slender resources to supply Catholics with literature¹ on every branch of economics, to found and propagate study-clubs, to stimulate and direct by conferences and lectures zeal for Christian reform, and it has accomplished a vast deal of most necessary work. But in spite of the cordial approval of ecclesiastical authority, it remains a small body, grievously crippled by want of means, at a time when the need of its exertions is greater than ever.

Yet, as we have implied, Catholic zeal is not altogether dead. It flourishes amongst our devoted parochial clergy, who constantly add labours for social betterment to their spiritual ministrations and it finds scope for heroic exercise amongst our Religious of both

¹ The publications of various sorts issued by the Guild now number over forty, a surprising output, considering the poverty of its equipment.

sexes who devote their lives to the helpless, the sick and the poor. Amongst the laity the widespread Society of St. Vincent of Paul is ever engaged in the works of mercy. These are what we may call the normal fruits of the second commandment of the Law, which are always and everywhere produced in the Church. But what the Cardinal calls "The Nation's Crisis" has stimulated further developments. The Catenian Society of professional and business men is becoming increasingly interested in the work of social reform and, of better augury still, that ably directed and widespread association, the Catholic Women's League, which now numbers about 12,500 members, has thrown itself with great vigour into the study of social problems in order that Christian principles may have a hearing in the rebuilding of society.¹ A further evidence of the growth of the "social sense," which ought to be the natural outcome of a Catholic education, was given quite recently by an important London Conference of Nun-Teachers, representing all the Religious Orders engaged in education, which resolved that the study of social questions should henceforth form an integral part of Catholic secondary education. This, as it affects the rising generation who will have to join in shaping the new social order, is already a departure fore-shadowing immense possibilities.

Catholic Disunion To be a Catholic, yet to confine one's interests in to one's own family and fortunes in the temporal extra-ecclesiastical matters. order, and, in the spiritual, to one's own parish church and its activities is really to belie one's profession. Catholic zeal should be all-embracing, or else there is no meaning in the epithet. The fortunes of the Church in every land, the welfare of all sections of the State—these are the interests of one who has, in his measure, "put on Christ," and is no longer selfish or class-conscious or parochial. The shade of disparagement attached to the last word suggests one possible reason for what is lacking in Catholic zeal amongst us and the real absence of effective social unity. The organization of the Church into dioceses and parishes, which is so necessary for ecclesiastical purposes and so admirably adapted to the needs of government, is apt, in matters civic and temporal, to induce narrowness of outlook and to provoke jealousy instead of co-operation. That is a tendency to face and to overcome. There are other reasons, no doubt, for lack of unity,—our comparative fewness and our dispersion amongst vast numbers of non-Catholics, the traditions of quiescence inspired by our history, racial animosity due to the standing quarrel with Ireland—but, we venture to think, that the "paro-

¹ See "A Brief Report of the Work of the Catholic Women's League, 1917-1918."

chial" mind is the chief. It can be overcome only by an intelligent use of the Catholic Press, which addresses itself to the Catholic body as a whole, and by becoming active members of such societies as the C.T.S., the C.W.L., the C.S.G., the C.Y.M.S., the A.P.F., the Catenians, etc., the scope and membership of which transcend the diocese and the parish. There are Catholic households one knows of into which a Catholic paper never enters and where blank ignorance prevails regarding the meaning of the above initials. Such people have become merged in their secular surroundings. We should aim at making them as few as possible.

**An Example
from
The States.**

No word has yet reached us about the prospect of holding a National Catholic Congress this year. Although these gatherings, suspended during the war, never fulfilled all their possibilities, their usefulness was very great, and it would be regrettable if their revival were postponed longer than is felt to be necessary. Taking the extent of territory into consideration, American Catholics have greater difficulties than we have to contend against, yet they have organized themselves in various ways much more perfectly than ourselves. The capabilities of the Knights of Columbus, hitherto a matter of press-report, have been brought within our actual experience by the war. They have stimulated, concentrated, and directed the whole Catholic war-effort of the States, outside the sphere of Government action. They have raised enormous sums of money for the supply of spiritual and medical aid, shelter, recreation, comforts of every sort for American troops, at home, here, and on the Continent, and no European organization, as far as we know, has been able to claim the proud motto of their Huts—"Everybody welcome, everything free." Now that they have proved their efficiency and the value, never theoretically in doubt, of united and universal effort, the Knights are going to prove an invaluable force in the reconstruction period. These 500,000 men, with one definite standard of morality, one certain faith and the inspiration of the Gospel to guide them, growing as they must in numbers and force, should do much to save civilization from the poison of materialism and counteract both the anarchic and chauvinistic elements in their community.

The existence of this body fills us with envy. We have the same ideals, the same standards, the same inspiration, the same colossal task, yet hitherto we have failed to leaven the non-Catholic mass around us because we will neither adequately support existing Catholic organisations nor insist that in view of matters which demand common action these organisations shall be federated into one great body. What has been attempted in the past has already

been sketched in these pages¹: the need of unity is as great as ever, or greater. Are we going to let slip the present opportunity?

A recent inspiring pastoral of the Bishop of Northampton emphasises these reflections. As **World Unity Amongst Catholics.** a step and a necessary step towards the re-baptizing of civilization, his Lordship urges that the English language, the tongue of three or four hundred Bishops all over the world, should be converted from the service of error to the service of truth. Last month we happened to illustrate the need to which the Bishop calls attention, at least in one department of letters.² We are glad to be able to add the unexceptionable testimony to the same fact of the *Cambridge Modern History*, the editors of which in their opening preface write as follows:—

The long conspiracy against the revelation of truth has gradually given way, and competing historians all over the civilized world have been zealous to take advantage of the change. . . . In view of changes and of gains such as these [access to archives, etc.] it has become impossible for the historical writer of the present day to trust without reserve even the most respected of secondary authorities. The honest student finds himself continually deserted, retarded, misled by the classics of historical literature.

Should not Catholics be alive to the opportunity in this and all other branches of literature of putting forward the long-hidden truth, which need only to be known in order to prevail? The Bishop would make them so and, therefore, points to the lessons to be learnt from the great war. In this prolonged conflict propaganda, often unscrupulous and false, played a very considerable part. The "Prussian legend" was largely in possession of the mind of the world and had to be refuted and destroyed. Hence the national need of publicity, a need which is equally ours in our conflict against falsehood. We do not use it enough. The splendid armoury of the Catholic Truth Society is hidden away in the business part of the City, out of sight of the non-Catholic public except of the few that drift into our churches and see the display in the porches. The C.S.G. conducts its business, efficiently enough, in something resembling a cellar. The C.W.L. has its habitat towards the top of a lofty building, and various other Catholic enterprises are equally inconspicuous. If properly supported they would be able to take prominent positions in main streets and so secure the main requisite of propaganda, advertisement.

Again, his Lordship shows how war has taught us the value of

¹ See "Catholic Confederation" *THE MONTH*, July, 1918.

² See "The Lie in English History" *THE MONTH*, Jan., 1919.

combination to ensure victory. And in applying this to the Catholic cause, his vision ranges beyond the limits we suggested above, for he contemplates amongst the English-speaking Catholics a common policy of social and industrial reconstruction, formulated by the united Episcopate of the Commonwealth and the States and goes on:

If the leaders of Catholic opinion in the States and Colonies become household names here, and ours there: if intercourse between our isolated and scattered churches can be made as frequent, cordial and practical as the intercourse between the still more isolated and scattered churches of the ancient Roman world; then we may face the uncertainties of the future in full confidence, for then the truth will be assured of that publicity, which, as we have said, is the only human factor indispensable for its ultimate victory.

After all, a greater Teacher than his Lordship, He who came into the world to give testimony of the Truth, urged exactly the same policy of advertisement and publicity when He uttered His famous *Sic luceat lux vestra coram hominibus*.

The C.T.S.
and
Anti-Rationalism. By way of practical application of that text and in view of the vigorous rationalist propaganda whereby the R.P.A. in their mistaken zeal are trying to prevent the return of Society to the principles of Christianity, we are glad to call attention to the following antidotal publications of the C.T.S., which will be found useful for distribution, especially in military centres, huts, rest-camps, etc., where the poison is busily at work:—

The World and its Maker, and *Agnosticism*, by the late Father John Gerard, S.J.; *Personal Immortality*, by the Rev. Dr. Downey; *The Virgin Birth*, by Father Martindale, S.J.; *Thoughts for Freethinkers*, by Canon William Barry; *Faith and Facts*, by Professor A. J. Rahilly; "*Dont's*" for Students in Science and History, by Professor G. S. Boulger; and *What is the Good of God?*

This selection costs only eighteen pence, post free, and should be ordered as the "Anti-Rationalist Selection." As soon as the price of paper allows reprinting, it will be possible to add to it many other useful pamphlets of the same kind.

The Postulates of the League of Nations. Nothing could be more admirable than the sentiments uttered by M. Poincaré and other leading statesmen at the opening of the Peace Conference. "It is not only Governments," said the President, "but free peoples who are represented here," and the task before the delegates, he went on, was the pursuit of

justice, "justice that has no favourites, justice in territorial problems, justice in financial problems, justice in economic problems . . . What justice banishes is the dream of conquest and imperialism, contempt for national will, the arbitrary exchange of provinces between States as though peoples were but articles of furniture or pawns in a game." M. Clémenceau was even more definite. "The League of Nations," he said, "has its being here; it has its being in you. It is for you to make it live, and for that *there is no sacrifice to which we are not ready to consent*; I do not doubt that, as you are all of this disposition, we shall arrive at this result, but *only on condition that we exercise impartial pressure on ourselves to reconcile what in appearance may be opposing interests in the higher view of a greater, better, and higher humanity.*" In the words italicised lie all our hopes of a successful issue of the Conference. Unless each Sovereign State is prepared to sacrifice something of its powers of initiative and independent action for the sake of the higher goods of harmony and justice, the League must ever remain a dream. It seems to us, looking at the matter impartially, that much of the agitation regarding the maintenance of British naval supremacy ignores the fact that the League of Nations in being means the abolition of the old world-order and the substitution of a new. If the rest of the League of Nations—a thing they might well do if only for economy's sake,—were to leave to Britain the policing of the seven seas and on that score acquiesce in her immense naval preponderance, then well and good: only the British tax-payer might grudge paying the whole cost of what should be a common burden. But short of that free agreement, to go into the Peace Conference saying we are willing to join the League, but at the same time we intend to provide for our security in just the same way as before, would be to make the whole proceedings a farce. Let us face the facts. Is it fair or tolerable to self-respecting Sovereign States to insist that they should depend for security at sea on the mere good-will of one of their number? If they freely recognize that the exceptional character of the British Commonwealth justifies her claim to naval supremacy, that is another matter: but otherwise the freedom of the seas should be guaranteed internationally, and all nations should contribute to the common police-force in proportion to their powers and needs.

Sir H. Stephen
and
Unchanging
Human Nature.

President Wilson may congratulate himself that his insistence on a League of Nations as the only secure foundation for international morality: a force, *i.e.*, which will aim at preventing or punishing war as effectually as the State prevents or punishes murder, has won the adhesion of all the members of the Conference. M. Clémenceau whose words we have just quoted had a short

while ago no higher ideal than the old futile Balance of Power. The President has apparently converted him, but there are many still to be converted. There are many who have so little realized the significance of the late war that they are quite content to begin preparing for another. A certain Sir Herbert Stephen, an elderly lawyer, has made himself in the January *Nineteenth Century* spokesman for that curious type. He calls the League of Nations, a "League of Dreams": he thinks it should not be attempted: he hopes if it is started it will fail. He revels in the difficulties its conception involves but first and last his main argument is—human nature cannot change: there have always been wars and there will always be wars and it is no use trying to prevent them. Unless he were voicing a too prevalent opinion, this determinist would merit no notice whatever; his arguments are puerile: it is only his assumptions that are dangerous. It is simply ludicrous to see this legal Mrs. Partington setting himself to drive back the rising tide of human thought and sentiment in favour of the abolition of war as a means of settling international disputes, and to put right such ignoramuses as His Holiness, the Pope, such dreamers as President Wilson, such amateurs as Viscount Grey, such sentimentalists as General Smuts, such shallow thinkers as Sir Robert Cecil, such fanatics as M. Clémenceau, such fools in regard to their own interests as the entire forces of Labour throughout the world. It is rather Sir Herbert Stephen who is dreaming. The "unchangeableness of human nature," of which he makes such capital, is one of those vague phrases which a lawyer above all men should carefully define before using. It means, we presume, in this connection the inherent instinctive egotism of men, which blossoms into national egotism in the State, and which is unchangeable only in the sense that it is an essential and permanent quality of the individual and the community. That it cannot be checked, suppressed, directed, modified, is a gratuitous assumption belied by history and everyone's daily experience. Selfishness whether personal or national can and should always be kept under due control by rational and free beings. What the League of Nations postulates is such a change in "human nature" as will imply a desire, on the part of the leagued nations, for justice first and self-interest afterwards (not that the two are inconsistent except in appearance); and a willingness to submit disputed claims to arbitration instead of enforcing them by the strong hand, the normal attitude of any honourable man towards his fellows.

The Pope
and
the President.

President Wilson fully realizes the necessity of such a change nor does he ignore the difficulties. He spoke much in Italy of the need of a new departure. "There is only one thing which holds nations together," he said, "if you exclude force, and that is

friendship and good will . . . Our task in Paris is to organize the friendship of the world, to see to it that all the moral forces that make for right and justice and liberty are united and given a vital organization . . . In other words, our task is no less colossal than this—to set us a new international psychology.”

Whatever passed between Pope and President during that historic meeting at the Vatican on Saturday, Jan. 4, we may be sure that the latter left the audience still further heartened to carry through that colossal task. The Catholic Church has laboured through the ages to set up that “new international psychology,” to make Right supreme, and Law dispossess lawless Might, to impress upon the international conscience the plain precepts of the decalogue. It is a sign of the feeble Christianity of Sir Herbert Stephen and his class that they style these aspirations impractical idealism.

The secular press was very anxious for the world to know that the President could spare the Pope only twenty minutes, and some journals stressed the fact that “immediately afterwards” he purged himself from contact with Romanism by driving to the American Episcopal church to receive addresses from his countrymen. We may presume that the President did in both cases what he felt duty and courtesy demanded. The late Mr. Roosevelt was less wise, and, by lending his patronage to a pestilent proselytising agency in Rome, gave gross offence to the 20,000,000 Catholics of the States and made it impossible for the Pope to receive him. If these proselytisers, who, we believe, are chiefly American Methodists, have settled in Rome out of zeal for Christianity and not rather to annoy Catholics, they are not easily discouraged. After spending vast sums of money, their only effective argument with the benighted Italian, they have to face an actual decrease in their numbers. In 1901, according to the census, the Protestants in Rome numbered 4,993: in 1911, 3,753. On the other hand the numbers of those of “no religion” rose from 2,689 in 1901 to 15,806 in 1911, so their propaganda may have had some effect, after all.

Our Bourbons and Labour. An aftermath of civic disturbances always follows a great war, even when there is question only of taking up accustomed ways and sliding back into the grooves of peace. But these natural troubles are accentuated in the present case by the fact that a great many people cannot and a great many will not go back to the old order. The sooner we realize this the better for our peace. Yet a section of the Press typified by the *Saturday Review* is determined not to realize it. Untouched by or misreading the meaning of the war, it is giving free rein once more to its old prejudices and decrying all attempts at making a better

world. Now that American help is no longer necessary the *Saturday* reverts once more to its accustomed abuse of that nation,¹ proclaims anew its irrational belief in the inevitability of war, takes up again its wonted jeers at Labour and at Democracy, insulting with incredible blindness the power that will presently rule this land and will not forget those insults. We are wont to wonder at the stupidity of the ante-Revolution French regime which so ignored the signs of the times. A greater darkness would seem to have descended on those whose spirit finds expression in this prejudiced print, for surely the signs of the times are open and palpable enough. The unrest in the Army, in the Police Force, and in industry generally, is not a passing accidental symptom. It means that the day of the workers is at hand. Those unnumbered humble and laborious units, on whose monotonous toil the whole structure of society is based, are determined, come what may, to assert their right to a fair share in the good things of life—property, education, leisure, recreation—which the social system has hitherto put practically beyond their reach. If they cannot get their share without upsetting the social system they will have no scruple in doing so. Power without accountability, honour without merit, wealth without service, every sort of unjustified privilege and monopoly—these things will no longer be tolerated. The exploiting of man by man, and of nation by nation must be brought to an end. These are the present thoughts and purposes of Labour, which the *Saturday* would have us ignore or, possibly, suppress. The policy of suppression was tried in imperialist Russia and Bolshevism was the result. And the policy of the ostrich will not stay the coming peril. Our statesmen and ruling classes should take such measures as will satisfy justice, before the cry for reform becomes revolution. And the censor who rightly suppresses anarchic publications might bestow careful attention on those other organs that use every weapon of contempt and slander to excite class-hatred.

**An Attack
on**

French Canada.

The need of some really active and efficient organization, such as that adumbrated in the January *Catholic Gazette*, to counter press attacks upon Catholic faith and practice, is becoming daily more manifest. Our existing methods are not adequate. The Vigilance Committee of the Westminster Federation and the antidotal pages of C.B.N. and of other periodicals like our own, cover only a small portion of the ground, and even so are not co-ordinated. What is wanted is an organization on a large scale, with a central Committee in frequent session and a systematized plan, which can

¹ In its current issue it permits an anonymous correspondent to style President Wilson "that ridiculous creature."

survey the whole press and apply the best talent where needed. The Catholic Evidence Guild and the Ransom Society train speakers for the public parks, rightly judging that so important a matter as the exposition of the Catholic faith cannot be entrusted to all and sundry. There is no lack of trained writers amongst us: the difficulty, which we trust the Editor of the *Catholic Gazette* will overcome, is to learn of the attack and secure its refutation by a competent hand. Meanwhile, we may briefly notice, as illustrating the need, several disgraceful assaults upon our French fellow-citizens in Canada which have found congenial harbourage in the *Saturday Review*, Jan. 4th and 11th. There was first an anonymous article casting scorn on Quebec because of its attitude towards the war, followed by a letter from an Orange fanatic, advertising a preposterous no-Popery book of his wherein he has triumphantly shown the complicity of the Vatican with that attitude. Happily in this case both attacks were answered by Mr. Francis Grey, on January 25th, in the only effective way in which falsehoods can be refuted, *viz.*, by stating the truth and the evidence that supports it. And, as it were by anticipation, the whole rancorous Orange spirit that thus found vent was mercilessly exposed in that remarkable book which we reviewed in our last issue, and to which we gladly call attention anew—*The Clash: a Study in Nationalities*, by W. H. Moore.

Racial Arrogance.

The essence of that Orange spirit is the unpleasing compound of racial and religious insolence which we have so often denounced in these pages as the very antithesis of justice and Christian charity. Bad enough in Ulster, its original home, it seems to get an extra tinge of virulence when transported to America, Australia and Canada, probably from association with some low brand of Freemasonry. In the political sphere it issues in pure Prussianism,—Pan-Germanism, Pan-Americanism, Pan-Anglicanism—as the principle of nationality unchecked by Catholicism is apt to do. In Canada it is opposed by the French, who wish to keep, and have of course every right to keep, their religion, culture and language: hence its fury against Quebec. It wants to make the Dominion "Anglo-Saxon" and its use of that absurd phrase, so rightly satirised in "The Clash," is indicative at once of its want of education and of true patriotism. The enforced predominance of one race in a Commonwealth of peoples is as Hunnish an ideal as the predominance of one nation in the family of nations. And in any case, as the experts tell us, there is no Anglo-Saxon race to vaunt this superiority. Would it not be advisable, asks Miss Eleanor Hull in the *Times*,¹ to drop "a term which in no way corresponds to the mixed nation of Celts, Romanized Britons, Danes, and Norsemen, Normans,

¹ T. L. S. Nov. 14th.

Huguenot French and Flemish industrialists (with many other additions) which in fact we are. We do not pride ourselves, as Green does, on being a 'German race,' 'a low-German branch of the Teutonic family,' nor are we so in fact." We are familiar with Mr. Dooley's appreciation of the "Anglo-Saxon" race in the States—a last word on the subject if ridicule could kill. The following satiric passage is more recent if somewhat cruder. The speaker is a negro from Georgia—

Ah don wondah dat dem Chutones hab had eberyting dere own way so far. Who's dey had to fight against? Nobuddy but half-strainers—Englishmunns and Frenchmunns. But you all just wait till us Angry-Saxons gits ober dah and gits aftah 'em. We'll show 'em what's what.'

However, the misapplication of a name is a minor offence and may be excused in the uneducated. What is criminal and contemptible is the attempt to claim supremacy, under cover of such a name, and by methods of violence and persecution, for one particular type of culture over others which have equal rights in the Commonwealth.

THE EDITOR.

1 "The Nation at War" by Dr. J. A. B. Sherer quoted in *The Fortnightly Review* (St. Louis).

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Marriage, Law of: Changes in New Code [S. Woywood, O.F.M., in *Homiletic Monthly*, Dec., 1918].

Pope, The: Proper Catholic attitude towards his ruling [Ch. Gauthier in *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*, Jan. 15, 1919, p. 484].

Self-Government: Catholic Teaching as to the Right of [Dr. J. A. Ryan in *Catholic World*, Jan., 1919, p. 441].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Anglicanism: Canonical obedience in [J. Britten in *Month*, Feb., 1919]; Its failure to teach [S. F. Smith, S.J., in *Month*, Jan., 1919, p. 31].

Catholic Truth Guild: its work in U.S.A. [W. Goldstein in *America*, Jan. 11, 1919, p. 335].

English History: How corrupted by falsehood [J. Keating, S.J., in *Month*, Jan., 1919, p. 1].

Modernistic Conceptions of the Church [S. F. Smith, S.J., in *Month*, Feb., 1919, p. 92].

New Thought Vagaries [C. C. Martindale, S.J., in *Dublin Review*, Jan.—March, 1919, p. 65].

"Theology, Warfare of Science with" [Dr. A. White's volume exposed by J. J. Walsh in *America*, Nov. 16, 1918, p. 127].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Action, Lord: his false historical interpretations [*Bombay Examiner*, Nov. 16, 23, 1918].

Catechism, The need of simplifying the [Rev. M. B. Kelly in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Jan., 1919, p. 36].

REVIEWS

I—THE EUCHARISTIC LIFE¹

THE *Eucharistic Life* bears no author's name but contains the substance of Addresses given by two members of the Brotherhood of the Epiphany attached to the Oxford Mission at Calcutta; they were given at the Students Conference of the Syrian Christian Church held at Kottayam on May 1st—5th, 1916. As an introduction to the Addresses this little volume also contains an account of a visit paid by the Superior of this Oxford Mission to the Syrian Church in question. These Syrians are the Christians, or a small portion of the Christians, on the Malabar coast. They are not Syrians themselves but natives of the district, but they are called Syrians because the larger body, of which they are one of the off-shoots, was converted as far back as the second or third century, by missionaries from Syria, and still retain the Syrian language in their liturgical books. The Anglican clergyman who writes this account seems to have been much taken with them and was struck by their "bright, keen, intelligent faces," he even anticipates for them, if only a select class from among them can be induced to embrace the religious life, the high vocation of becoming the apostles of Christianity to the natives of India, as the ancient monks were to the early inhabitants of Europe. And no doubt there are pleasing qualities in these people and they might have been instruments for a fine apostolic work had they been throughout in the unity of the Church and under the rule and supervision of the Apostolic See. He has, however, to allow that this "Syrian" community requires to be "united, educated, and inspired," as it certainly does, and far more so than his own account of them could lead anyone to suppose. For, in the first place, he makes no reference whatever to the Uniat section which yet constitutes the larger half of their number and stands united, whilst the smaller half is sub-divided into several sub-sections, with only one of which the Calcutta visitors came in contact. Or at all events the group which he calls the "Mar Thoma Church" is one so Protestantized by the manipulations of the Church Missionary Society, that it has by now lost the most distinctive features which assimilate the other branches in some measure to Catholicism.

The eight addresses to the Malabar schismatics are all directed

¹ Addresses given at the Students' Conference at Kottayam in May, 1916. London: Longmans. Pp. xvii. 80. 1918.

towards bringing out the importance of Holy Communion as a complement to the duty of assisting at the Holy Sacrifice. They are commendable enough in themselves, though one may doubt if they were intelligible to the simple audience to which they were addressed. They seem to be of the sort that would be acceptable to English educated audiences, but to them only. Still, in saying this we do not wish to carp at a missionary book which was evidently well-intended; we wish only to comment with sadness on the spectacle of so much good effort being thrown away on a class of people who by their separation from the unity of the Apostolic See have become involved in a state of ignorance and division which makes it hard for them to take in Catholic Truth.

2—A FRENCH HERO OF THE AIR¹

OF the many young men who have distinguished themselves in the Great War, few have been so beloved as George Guynemer, the famous French airman. It was not solely his aerial feats—he brought down fifty-five German machines—but also his winning personality and his unswerving devotion to duty which made him a favourite among officers and men. His biography by M. H. Bordeaux reflects this attractiveness. The Guynemer family dates back to the days of Charlemagne and numbers among its ancestors many crusaders and valiant warriors. George was always delicate, for months together he was absent from the Jesuit school at Compiègne where he was educated; the thin over-grown body seemed too frail an envelope for the restless eager spirit. He was no leader of men, although many men followed his unconscious leadership; when playing at soldiers in the college playground he always chose to be one of the rank and file, he never aspired to be the general. It was hardly surprising that his father would not permit him to take up aviation when the time came for him to choose a career, and it was not until three months after the outbreak of War that a chance encounter with an aviator who descended on the beach at Biarritz, fanned to life his slumbering ambition. He had been refused by the military tribunal as physically unfit for active service, but here surely was a means of serving! This time his father readily gave his consent, and after much pleading with the commanding officer at the aviation station at Pau, the boy was engaged as pupil-mechanician, a severe test for a delicately nurtured sensitive youth. Here the mechanical knowledge culled in school-days from mechanics, motor exhibitions, prospectuses, and science manuals was of incalculable value; indeed no one does justice to Guynemer's talents who does not emphasize his strong scientific bent. He who seemed to be made of quicksilver, yet had the cool

¹ *Vie Heroique de Guynemer*. By Henry Bordeaux, Paris. Plon Nourrit et Cie. Pp. 320. Price 4.50 fr., 1918. English Edition. London: Chatto and Windus, 6s.

calculating brain of a man of mature age; it is said of him that he never attacked under impulse; every action was carefully thought out; will and intelligence worked together with lightning rapidity. Again, he never flew without first verifying all his instruments and weapons. He knew every part of the intricate mechanism of his aeroplane, and after overcoming much official opposition he succeeded in having a machine constructed which embodied several of his own inventions, but unhappily this was only two months before his death. Guynemer in the air was as a king come to his own, his keen black eyes could pierce the breaking clouds and see further than any other aviator for a trace of enemy craft. For sometime he was stationed near to Compiègne, and frequently on his return from the Boche lines he would circle over the beloved home, executing fantastic curves and loops over the house-top to the terror of his poor mother. Decorations were rained upon him, he was the spoilt child of the aviation corps; yet he was never really spoilt, for, although he naturally was gratified by his honours, he would pull a handful of medals out of his pocket and scatter them laughingly on the table, like a boy displaying his prizes to his family. Popular ovations he always avoided when possible; letters asking for autographs, etc., were torn up; only those from school friends, children, or soldiers, received an answer. He loved the *poilu*; one of his proudest moments was when it was said of him in the Army Order conferring on him the rank of officer of the Legion of Honour, "that by his exploits he had assisted in rousing the courage and enthusiasm of those who, from the trenches, were witnesses of his triumphs."

Unhappily George Guynemer was as we should say, all nerves, and the fact that the majority of his flights were taken alone served to increase the nervous tension, and there seems to have been no one with sufficient influence over him to endeavour to restore his mental equilibrium. During the last few weeks his father ventured upon a protest, but was met by the rejoinder: "As long as one has not given everything, one has given nothing." To kill a Boche every day became an obsession with him during those palpitating days of the battle of Flanders, and the day which had not its prize was a day lost. This devouring passion ultimately led to his death. His own beloved machine was away for repairs, he had gone up in another aeroplane overtired, and overstrained, but, doggedly resolved to find a Boche, and, reckless as ever, he ventured too close to the enemy and was killed by a ball in the head. It was not until two months later that news was received as to what had become of him; then it was learned through the intervention of the Spanish Ambassador that he had fallen within the German lines at Poelcapelle, but the spot where he came to earth being at that time under the English fire, burial was impossible; so, as he would have wished, he did not have to accept even a wooden cross from his captors.

One could have wished that his biographer could have given us some fuller details of his spiritual life; we know that Guynemer

was a practising Catholic, as a schoolboy we are told that "his habitual giddiness vanished at the door of the chapel" In Paris he was a familiar figure at the church of St. Pierre de Chaillot where he was accustomed to prepare himself for the battle to take place on the morrow

To the student of war the life of George Guynemer has an additional interest from its detailed description of the progress of aerial belligerency, but its chief charm undoubtedly lies in the revelation it conveys of an admirable character, the best French type of the "happy warrior."

3—THEOU SOPHIA¹

WE have spoken elsewhere in this number of the extravagant lengths to which the syncretism dominant in Theosophy and other kindred cults has recently extended. The book now before us provides a forcible reminder that Mrs. Besant and Mr. Leadbeater have found many imitators. Our first inclination would be to dismiss such a volume with the curt remark that to review it in the ordinary sense of the word would be utter waste of time. If there are readers capable of putting faith in this insane medley of astrology, Buddhism, gnosticism, caballism, and the Christian Scriptures, such people are beyond the reach of any deterrent arguments which we are able to bring to bear. But there are one or two points which incline us to take the matter more seriously. The first is that the book, which, in spite of the wretched quality of the paper, costs 8s. 6d. net, is published by a respectable English firm, the same in fact as that which for many years past has published the well-known *Catholic Dictionary*. Of course, if Messrs. Kegan Paul like to see their imprint attached to a volume of this kind it is no business of ours. But the fact, none the less, marks a stage in the development of the occultist movement—a movement, we fancy, which is less one of religious mysticism, than of religious mystification in the Gallic sense of the word. We have as much respect, neither less nor more, for the pronouncements of Mr. Holden Sampson, as we have for those of the late M. Joséphin Paladan, or Dr. Orlando Miller, or M. Léo Taxil, or Mr. F. L. Rawson, or Mr. Aleister Crowley. But while Mr. Crowley, for example, was at any rate a *farceur* of exceptional brilliancy, Mr. Sampson is as dull as ditchwater.

On the other hand, Mr. Sampson lays claim to a quite exalted orthodoxy. That "True Gnosis" which ever since the days of

¹ *Theou Sophia, Elucidating the Science and Philosophy of the Divine Mysteries, A Complete Epitome and Analysis of Cosmological Science embodied in the Ancient Wisdom-Foundations.* By Holden Edward Sampson. London: Kegan Paul. Pp. xxviii. 362. Price, 8s. 6d. 1918.

ancient Alexandria has been lost to mankind, has apparently become a sort of monopoly in the keeping of the author of this book. Here are the modest terms in which he announces his mission :

The only testimony the author is able to give in support of the statements in these lessons, is that he has found out the secret of KNOWING—Gnosticism—that self-same secret by which the ancient Philosophers KNEW without being told in any verbal method of speech. He knows that within him is boundless consciousness and intelligence of all things belonging to Nature and the universe. [So also say Mrs. Besant and Mr. Leadbeater.] Unlike the guesses of Haeckel, or the greater hypotheses of Darwin, and the splendid generalizations of Spencer, or again the bold tirades of Huxley ; he is able "to speak with authority and not as the Scribes " (p. 13).

Let it not, however, be supposed that our teacher is prepared to lend himself to the amorphous comprehensiveness of the New Thought philosophy. For the reader who has wearied of the vapid platitudes of Mr. Trine or Mr. Atkinson, it is quite refreshing to learn from these pages that in order to become true Sampsonites "we must get back to the acceptance of the Personal God, of JESUS CHRIST, HIS ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON, and of the HOLY GHOST proceeding from the FATHER and the SON" (the capitals are those of the original). Similarly we are agreeably surprised to read that :

Of True Masters and Initiates there are but one or two in the Occident at the present time who are capable of exercising WHITE MAGIC, owing to the fact that there is a vast and exceedingly pestilential wave of spurious and extremely vicious "Psychism" and "Occultism" spreading over the world in these "perilous times," which will, ere it subsides, swamp the world in an ocean of Astralism, when infatuated people will "give heed to seductive spirits and doctrines of Demons," inculcating and practising methods of false "Yogi" and psychical development (p. 120).

And then the author goes on to speak of the many varieties of so-called "mystic," "occult," "esoteric" and "psychic" movements, "now sweeping over the Occident, under the secret domination of the Demons and Astral 'Spirits' of Lawlessness, given over to ruthless vampirism and uncleanness, preying upon mankind to gratify their devilish lusts, 'leading captive silly women'"; and he describes "BLACK MAGIC" as "the Force that exercises and energises the practices of the many forms of the Healing Arts—psychic, mental, magnetic or hypnotic—such as are employed in Christian Science, New Thought, and organizations under many other names." On the other hand, Mr. Sampson assures us that "in consequence of the Church's apostasy from the Apostolical foundations . . . 'Christianity' represents an ancient and colossal

Fraud and Superstition, the following of the DEMON GODS of this World."

But what is Mr. Sampson's own message? Here is one of the fundamental teachings of his recovered Gnosis:

That the Universe is itself an organic whole, a complete Organism constructed in perfect intrinsic functional capacity, androgynous, or male and female in one organism; that the Houses of the Zodiac constitute the male, and the Planetary Circles the female; and that by the generative functions of the Male and Female in the Cosmical Organism the Evolution of species takes effect in the revolutions of organisms, in the Planetary Spheres passing through the Twelve Houses of the Zodiac (p. 11).

There are pages upon pages of stuff like this, mystifying the unfortunate reader with "the Seven Planets," "the Seven Prismatic Rays of the Seven Natures," and "The Twelve Steps of the Path in each of the Seven Natures," with references to all the things which happen to be mentioned in Scripture in sevens or in twelves, all mixed up with scraps of biblical exegesis which remind us strongly of Mrs. Eddy's efforts in the same line of research. It was she, it will be remembered, who made the immortal discovery that "Adam=a damn, or a curse," until in another moment of still higher inspiration she realized that "Adam=a dam, or an obstruction." Thus Mr. Sampson tells us that "Jesus speaks of Paradise as 'Abraham's Bosom,' a term equivalent to the oriental synonym 'Brahma's Bosom'", or again he sets to work laboriously to prove that Satan's function as described in Scripture has been completely misrepresented, that he is really "the MASTER OF KARMA, as his dispensations are always Good, Salutory, Beneficent and Necessary for the sake of Mankind" (p.238). All this, we may note, and a great deal more in Mr. Sampson's book, comes straight from Mme. Blavatsky, though he has not apparently thought it necessary to give any indication of the fact.

Lastly, while we should have been disposed to imagine *prima facie* that this preposterous rubbish must have been produced by an inmate of Bedlam, we are confronted by the fact that Mr. Sampson, for many years a clergyman in the Church of England, has previously written several bulky works in the same style. Consequently *this sort of stuff sells*, and there are presumably people who read it. This very book, *Theou Sophia*, bears a sub-title "Foundations," and it appears from a fly-leaf that six other volumes are in contemplation, intended to develop the principles here laid down. Could fuller proof be needed of the prevalence at the present time of a wild and lawless Bolshevism in the field of religion as well as in that of politics?

SHORT NOTICES

THEOLOGICAL.

IN *The Hand of God: a Theology for the People* (Kenedy: \$1.00 net) Fr. M. Scott, S.J., continues that popular exposition of the Faith which he began so auspiciously in *God and Myself*, noticed in these pages a year ago. In this treatise he deals with various topics of revelation and various points of interaction between revealed religion and secular life—Miracles, Dogma, Indulgences, Purgatory, Intolerance, Evil and Suffering—just the themes which most frequently crop up in religious discussions and about which it behoves all Catholics to be instructed. The lay-apologist will find a well-stocked armoury of serviceable weapons in this excellent book.

Excellent apologetic work has also been done by means of the Lenten Lectures of Father William Robison, S.J., of St. Louis, two series of which are now published, viz., *Christ's Masterpiece: a Study of the One True Church*, and *His Only Son: the Truth of the Divinity of Christ* (Herder: both 6s. net). They are the utterances of a man who has thought out all the implications of his creed and achieved the art of expressing them with logical order and cogency. Belief in God, belief in Christ, belief in the Church, such analytically is the process by which one arrives at Catholicity. Father Robison shows how thoroughly reasonable this process is, once God's existence is taken for granted. We gather that a further course of lectures has been devoted to this last point. To read, master, and digest these two books would provide the apologist with a splendid equipment for his work.

BIBLICAL.

Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P., continues his valuable work of removing the reproach from English Catholic scholarship of not having produced anything to rival various popular Protestant manuals for the Biblical student, by issuing Vol. II. of his *Catholic Students' "Aids" to the Study of the Bible* (Washbourne: 5s. net.) which deals with *The Gospels*. The work has grown under his hands, and although the *Old Testament*, issued some five or six years ago, was completed in a single volume the New Testament claims two. This is natural and as it should be, for the New Testament is incomparably the more important for the Christian. In this volume Fr. Pope provides all that Protestant erudition could supply regarding the external questions which must precede the study of the text itself,—questions of history, chronology, topography, language, canonicity, textual criticism and versions. But he does not go to the Germans for his information, at least, not with the slavish deference of the modernist: he goes to the written tradition of the Catholic Church, the works of her Saints and Doctors, and thus supplies the student with what non-Catholic "Aids" altogether lack. No better antidote to the poison of rationalistic criticism can be imagined than this sober and scholarly work wherein all the *inania* of the modernist onslaught are fearlessly met and demolished. Not only to the professed student but to all who are exposed to meet in current literature the attacks on Scripture of the unbeliever, this volume will form a "very present aid," and an excellent Index enhances its utility.

MORAL.

That extremely useful collection of cases of conscience, compiled and edited by Father J. A. McHugh, O.P., and called *The Casuist* (Herder:

gs. net) has now reached its fifth volume. This contains upwards of one hundred moral problems, such as frequently occur, stated and solved with much clearness and calculated to keep the confessor alive to the bearing of moral principles.

There are moral questions so modern that even the encyclopedic mind of St. Thomas Aquinas never remotely contemplated them. The question of war, unhappily, is not one of these. St. Thomas had experience of war and in his *Secunda Secundæ* lays down the principles of just warfare and various allied subjects with his accustomed lucidity. This doctrine, the Rev. Professor A. Michel of Lille, who himself is not, one supposes, unacquainted with war, has developed and expounded in a timely volume *Questions de Guerre* (Beauchesne : 4.20 fr.). St. Thomas has something also to say in the same Part about the theological notion of Peace which is well worth considering.

DEVOTIONAL.

Yet another book on the Exercises ! Yet so vast is this the theme and so varied may be the treatment that we cannot *à priori* determine the newcomer to be superfluous. And a careful examination of Fr. Hugo Hurter's *An Eight-Day's Retreat* (Herder : 6s.) enables us readily to assign it a place amongst those which are really helpful. The matter is well ordered, a development of the meditations rather than a commentary on their form and plan, and the author has in view mainly clerics and religious. The translation is the work of J. B. Kokinge, S.J., and is capably done. We have failed however to find in our copy the supplementary meditations and considerations of all kinds and in different forms, mentioned in the preface as included in the volume.

SOCIOLOGICAL.

Rather than delay noticing Fr. Husslein's important book, *The World Problem : Capital, Labour, and the Church* (Kenedy : \$ 1.25) in order to give it the more extended review it deserves, we desire here and now to call the attention of all social students to its admirable exposition of the Catholic attitude in regard to current economic problems. Here is a response to the stirring call of Cardinal Bourne in his last year's Lenten Pastoral, when he pointed out that the world is looking forward to a new order of things, new social conditions, and new relations between the different sections of society, and urged Catholics not to remain apathetic at such a critical moment. Let them then learn from Fr. Husslein's work what they can and should do, and how they should do it. An insistent and consistent declaration of Catholic principles in speech and writing cannot now fail to secure a hearing. All the issues between Labour and Capital are at present under review and have gained more prominence since the war. How are they to be directed into the channels of lasting peace ? Fr. Husslein diagnoses the evils and discusses the remedies with the skill of an expert, and his book should make its mark.

The Catholic Social Guild will no doubt do something to make it known amongst us. But meanwhile is that excellent organization itself sufficiently well known ? Now in the tenth year of its existence and faced with a call upon its activities which is beyond precedent it ventures on a little necessary self-advertisement and issues as its Year Book for 1919 its *apologia*, entitled *The C. S. G. and its Work* (C. S. G. Office : 1s. net). It is a plain unvarnished tale of humble beginnings, constant growth amidst difficulties,

ever fresh developments, valuable literary output, much in hand and more in hopeful prospect. Starting in 1909 with about a dozen members, it now has eight Branches and well over a hundred affiliated Study-Clubs in active operation in different parts of the country. Its original capital was forty shillings, yet it started its literary labours at once and has managed to carry on, though always, unhappily, much hampered by want of funds. That is why it makes its appeal for more generous support: it needs convenient offices, it needs an organizing Secretary, it needs sufficient capital to finance each volume as it is produced, it needs and the times clamour for, a much greater output. No one, we venture to think, who reads this modest but inspiring record of its performances and its hopes, will deny that it deserves well of Catholicity and of Christian civilization.

If the National Mission of Repentance and Hope, of which we heard so much in 1916, failed to accomplish what its promoters aimed at, that failure must be attributed rather to the inherent inadequacy of the Anglican message than to any want of zeal and energy and method in presenting it. The splendid organization of the Anglican Church and the labours of her devoted members were well utilized, not only in the actual Mission itself, but also in the various Committees which were afterwards established to examine the lessons it taught and to suggest remedies for whatever was found amiss. We have already commented on some of the resulting Reports, none of which will have more interest for the general public than the fifth and last now before us, entitled **Christianity and Industrial Problems** (S.P.C.K.: 1s. net). It is a voluminous document running into some 150 pages of small print, and it deals thoroughly and systematically with its terms of reference, viz., "to consider and report upon the ways in which the Church may best commend the teaching of Christ to those who are seeking to solve the problems of industrial life." On the whole, the Catholic can endorse the view here taken of the relation between social life and the Gospel teaching. There is no attempt to minimise the latter or to condone the many departures from it which Protestant individualism has sanctioned. The necessity of restoring Christian principles to economics is fitly emphasized and illustrated. Perhaps the weakest part of the Report is the summary account of the interaction between ethics and economics in Church history, a weakness due to the confusion of "the Church" with the action of individual Churchmen, and the ignoring of the disastrous effect of the destruction of Christian unity at the Reformation.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The excellent **Official Catholic Directory of the Province of Birmingham for 1919** (Washbourne: 6d. net) gives much more detailed information about the clergy, and churches and other institutions of the Province, which includes, besides Birmingham, Clifton, Plymouth, and Shrewsbury, than is possible in the larger Catholic Directory, and presents further interesting features, such as a variety of "Notes" on the constitution of the Church, the liturgy, ecclesiastical precepts, marriage, indulgences, etc. peculiar to itself. It is a model of careful arrangement very creditable to its Editor, the Rev. W. A. Hofler, and remarkably cheap.

Of less extended interest but indispensable for all connected by locality or sympathy with the great family of St. Benedict is **The Benedictine Almanac and Guide for 1919** (3d., post free 4½d.) which is compiled and published by Dom T. I. Barton, O.S.B., of St. Benedict's, Warrington. Besides the usual Calendar there is full information concerning the present condition of

the English Congregation, with short accounts of the various houses and missions, including various Abbeys and Convents of nuns.

If the interesting story of an apparition which is supposed to "walk" in the Fellows' Garden, Christ's College, Cambridge, is true, as its quasi-legal presentment by Mr. A. P. Baker in *A College Mystery* (Heffer : 3s. 6d. net) aims at assuring the reader, the use of fictitious names and the absence of relative dates detracts greatly from its plausibility. Frankly, it does not convince us and hence all the apparatus with which it is set forth seems needlessly elaborate. But as a ghost-story and a clever study of character it can be thoroughly enjoyed.

The same author has published in mock-heroic couplets under the title of *University Olympians* (Heffer : 2s. 6d.) clever sketches of various University types at Cambridge, full of shrewdness and humour.

One feels that Mr. Leonard Green, whose slim book of essays *The Youthful Lover* (Blackwell : 3s. 6d. net.) has just appeared, is as much concerned with the form as with the substance of his work. He is an artist in language, aiming more at perfecting the vehicle of his thoughts and impressions than at enriching the world with new speculations. And so he is to be read with pleasure, though not without a certain amount of profit besides.

Sir Francis Piggott wrote his little book, *The Free Seas in War* (P. S. King : 2s. net), before the collapse of the German arms and the overthrow of Kaiserism. For a time at least the menace of militarism has disappeared, and so the arguments founded on the presence in the world of a Power which expressly repudiates international morality lose something of their force. His proposition is that the British Government, which for short he calls "England" throughout, is entitled because of the character of its possessions to maintain naval preponderance, and that *de facto* this has resulted as a rule in the good of civilization. Her giant's strength has not been used as a giant would use it. Thus in peace : whereas in war, the simple and natural rule should be that naval blockade should operate precisely as land blockade, there being no difference in principle between them. In his anxiety to prove the advisability of adhering to present conditions, he does not seem to have altogether realized the changes which will be introduced by the League of Nations.

More than half the booklet is occupied with a selection of extracts from the speeches and writings of David Urquhart, illustrating and defending those two articles of an effective blockade, the "Right of Seizure" and the "Right of Search." They are selected and ably commented upon by Mr. Sydney Parry.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

We have suffered so much in this country from bigoted and ill-informed attacks upon the Pope's action during the war that we can sympathize with our French brethren in like case, the more so because French anti-Catholics, being mainly Freemasons and Atheists, are more bitter and brutal in their methods than the same type here. M. Paul Dudon in *L'Action de Benoît XV Pendant la Guerre* (Beauchesne : 1.20 fr.), an answer to a slanderous anonymous onslaught in the *Revue de Paris*, has added another valuable volume to the series already existing in defence of the Pope, and has embodied in his reply the substance of the pamphlet *Deeds not Words*, issued recently by the *Universe*.

An able monograph in support of the French claims in the East, called

La Palestine et les problèmes actuels (Beauchesne: 1.20 fr.). It details the immense work for Christianity the queen of missionary countries has done and is doing in the East, and shows why the liquidation of the Turkish Empire should not leave France in worse condition in Palestine than before.

The "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," which is an outcome of the missionary spirit in the English Church and which, in spite of what we must call its limitations and misguided outlook, has laboured long for Christianity, is deserving of the attention of Catholics if only to afford a stimulus to their own zeal. All they will want to know they will find in Mr. W. K. Lowther Clarke's **A Short History of the S.P.C.K.** (Published by the Society: 1s. net).

Messrs. Spottiswoode and Co. publish for the Armenian Bureau a pamphlet entitled **The "Clean-Fighting" Turk: yesterday, to-day, and to-morrow** (Price, 3d. net) the contents of which, drawn from various sources, should destroy the legend of Turkish chivalry, once for all. It is unthinkable that, whatever be the outcome of the Peace Conference, any Christian or civilized nation should be left under the domination of this cruel and sensual Tartar tribe. We recommend the Bureau to go to Newman for a classic indictment of their barbarous foe.

The pamphlet **A Jewish Palestine** (Zionist Organization: 4d. post free) by H. Sacher, after discussing various alternatives, amongst them the immediate creation of a Jewish autonomous State, sets them all aside in favour of a present trusteeship to be held by Great Britain.

The last two issues of **The Catholic Mind** (America Press: 5c. each) for 1918 contain amongst other items an illuminating address on the backward *Economic Condition of Ireland*, papers on *The Duty of Divine Worship* and *Sunday Observance*, and a valuable essay on *The Reality of Religion*.

In **National Courts and International Law** (C.T.S.: 1d.) Miss Gertrude Robinson whilst rightly calling attention to the danger to national freedom of what would be practically a League of Strong Powers to coerce and dominate the weak does not, we think, do justice to the aims of the advocates of the League of Free Nations at present under discussion. Such a sweeping statement as "This [a League wherein all States had equal rights and whose basis is Law and Justice] does not seem to be the ideal of even the most idealistic promoters of the various League of Nations Societies" is a travesty of the facts. There is no statesman who does not postulate regard for right and justice as the necessary basis of the League and denounce anything like secret diplomacy in respect to its functions. And Catholics should remember that the Holy Father has warmly supported the project.

The Catholic Truth Society of Ireland has published an interesting account of the **Austin Canonesses of the Lateran** by M. D. Stenson which might well be added to the C. T. S.'s "Religious Orders" Series; **Home: the Nursery of Heaven**, Part I. by the Rev. Father Laurence, O.S.F.C. (Price 2d.); **Popular and Patriotic Poetry**, Part X. compiled by R. J. Kelly, K.C., and **Simple Thoughts about Holy Mass**.

From Sydney comes a telling little exposition of the claims of the Church, entitled **Why not be a Catholic?** (Dwyer: 4d.), and written by M. D. Forrest, M.S.H.

Thy Kingdom Come (Mission Press S.V.W.: 25 c.) is the title of a little manual of devotions, excellently printed and arranged, intended for use in Church missions. It is compiled by Father Bruno Hagspiel, of the Society of the Divine Word.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice).

- AMERICA PRESS, New York.
The Catholic Mind. Vol. XVI. Nos. 23, 24.
- BEAUCHESNE, Paris.
L'Action de Benoît XV. pendant la Guerre. By P. Dudon. Pp. 64. Price, 1 fr.
Questions Théologiques du Temps Présent : 1. Questions de Guerre. By A. Michel. Pp. xiv. 289. Price, 4.20 fr.
La Palestine et les Problèmes actuels. Pp. 56. (No author or price given.)
- BLACKWELL, Oxford.
The Youthful Lovers. By Leonard Green. Pp. 68. Price, 3s. 6d. net.
- CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD, London.
The C.S.G. and its Work. (Year-Book for 1919.) Pp. 80. Price, 1s. net.
Law of Nations Series. Nos. v. and vi. 1d. each.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.
 Several Penny Pamphlets.
- CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY OF IRELAND, Dublin.
 Four Penny Pamphlets.
- CATHOLIC WOMEN'S LEAGUE, London.
Report of the Work of the C.W.L., 1917-1918.
- DWYER, Sydney.
Why not be a Catholic? By M. D. Forrest, M.S.H. Price, 4d.
- ENCYCLOPEDIA PRESS, New York.
To the Heart of a Child. By J. Van-Dyke Brownson. Pp. xii. 193.
- GABALDA, Paris.
Études de Liturgie. By Pierre Batifol. Pp. vi. 327. Price, 4.20 fr.
- HEFFER, Cambridge.
University Olympians. By A. P. Baker. Pp. 39. Price, 2s. 6d.
A College Mystery. By A. P. Baker. Pp. xii. 76. Price, 3s. 6d. net.
- HERDER, London and St. Louis.
The Story of St Patrick's Purgatory. By Shane Leslie. Pp. xv. 78. Price, 2s. 6d. net.
His Only Son. By W. F. Robison, S.J. Pp. vi. 203. Price, 6s. net.
Christ's Masterpieces. By the same. Pp. vii. 203. Price, 6s. net.
St. Joseph of Cupertino. By A. Pastrovicchi, O.S.F.C. Pp. xiii. 135. Price, 4s. 6d. net.
Conferences for Men. By Rev. R. Kuehnell. Pp. 279. Price, 8s. 6d. net.
A Manual of the History of Dogmas. By B. J. Otten, S.J. 2 Vols. Pp. xiv. 523; xv. 551. Price, 9s. 6d. net; 10s. 6d. net.
Jesus in the Eucharist. By F. Girardey, C.S.S.R. Pp. 172. Price, 4s. 6d. net.
The Interdependence of Literature. By G. P. Curtis. Pp. 160. Price, 3s. net.
Is There Salvation Outside the Catholic Church? By J. Bainvel, S.J. Pp. ix. 96. Price, 2s. 6d. net.
The Casuist, Vol. V. Edited by J. A. McHugh, O.P. Pp. vii. 312. Price, 9s. net.
- Devotion to the Sacred Heart*. By J. G. Petrovits, J.C.B. Pp. xvi. 281. Price, 6s. net.
The Villa Rossignol. By M. L. Storer. Pp. iii. 384. Price, 4s. 6d. net.
William Stanton, S.J. By W. T. Kane, S.J. Pp. vii. 262. Price, 6s. net.
The Mediator. By P. Geiermann, C.S.S.R. Pp. vi. 394. Price, 5s. net.
Accidence of Hebrew Grammar. By H. A. Coffey, S.J. Pp. vi. 113. Price, 5s. net.
An Eight Day's Retreat. By H. Hurter, S.J. Pp. xv. 275. Price, 6s. net.
An Unwilling Traveller. By M. E. Donovan. Pp. 240. Price, 3s. 6d. net.
- KENEDY & SONS, New York.
The Hand of God. By M. J. Scott, S.J. Pp. xi. 208. Price, \$1.00 n.
- KING & SON, London.
The Free Seas in War. By Sir Francis Piggott. Pp. 81. Price, 1s. 6d.
- LONGMANS, London.
The Greek Orthodox Church. By Rev. C. Callinicos. Pp. ix. 60. Price, 3s. 6d. net.
- MISSION PRESS, Techny, Ill.
Thy Kingdom Come. By B. Hagspiel, S.V.D. Pp. 182. Price, 25 c.
- ROBERT SCOTT, London.
The Church Impotent here on Earth. By Rev. W. H. T. N. Rainey. Pp. viii. 250. Price, 10s. 6d. net.
Church or Sect. By A. C. Cooper-Marsdin, D.D. Pp. 291. Price, 6s. net.
- ST. BENEDICT'S, Warrington.
The Benedictine Almanac and Guide. Compiled by Dom T. I. Barton, O.S.B. Pp. 80. Price, 4½d. post free.
- S.P.C.K., London.
A Short History of the S.P.C.K. By W. R. Lowther Clarke. Pp. 106. Price, 1s. net.
The Second Century. By J. P. Whitney. Pp. viii. 135. Price, 3s. 6d. net.
- SPOTTISWOODE & CO., London.
The "Clean-Fighting" Turk. With Preface by Sir H. Johnston. Pp. 61. Price, 3d. net.
- UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge.
Studies in Early Indian Thought. By D. J. Stephen, S.Tu. Pp. viii. 176. Price, 6s. net.
- UNIVERSITY PRESS, Manchester.
Blessed Giles of Assisi. By W. W. Seton. Pp. x. 94.
- WASHBOURNE, London.
The Official Catholic Directory of the Province of Birmingham. Edited by Rev. W. A. Hofer, Pp. 285. Price, 6d. net.
- ZIONIST ORGANIZATION, London.
A Jewish Palestine. By H. Sacker. p. 23. Price, 4d. post free.

